School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1365573

PREACHING AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS

EDITED BY

G. BROMLEY OXNAM

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

James C. Bales
San F.
April 1953

BV
4235
56
085

Preaching and The Social Crisis

A SERIES OF LECTURES DELIVERED BEFORE THE BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Edited by
G. BROMLEY OXNAM
President of DePauw University

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

OXNAM (Editor)
PREACHING AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS

Copyright, 1933, by
THE ABINGDON PRESS, Inc.

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

THIS VOLUME IS DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF THE PIONEER PREACHER, WHO REVEALED THE CONQUERING CHRIST TO THE CONQUERORS OF A CONTINENT, IN THE EARNEST HOPE THAT HIS EXAMPLE MAY PROVE AN INSPIRATION TO THE PREACHERS OF THE PRESENT, WHO SEEK TO REVEAL A SUFFICIENT SAVIOUR TO A SINFUL SOCIETY.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	7
I.	PREACHING AND SOCIALISM Kirby Page	19
II.	COMMUNISM'S CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY Jerome Davis	37
III.	PREACHING AND THE INDUSTRIAL ORDER Harry Frederick Ward	57
IV.	PREACHING AND THE RACE PROBLEM William Nelson DeBerry	72
V.	THE PREACHER AND REVOLUTION G. Bromley Oxnam	94
VI.	THE PROPHETIC MINISTRY Francis John McConnell	109
VII.	PREACHING AND PERSONAL PROBLEMS Burris Atkins Jenkins	124
VIII.	PREACHING AND THE INNER KINGDOM Charles Wesley Burns	144
IX.	THE SOCIAL GOSPEL AND WORSHIP Fred Winslow Adams	160
X.	THE PREACHER'S PROFIT Merton Stacher Rice	177
XI.	THE POET PROPHET OF THE SOCIAL ERA William Leroy Stidger	186
XII.	PREACHING AND PROHIBITION Edwin Holt Hughes	208

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/preachingsocialc0000gbro

INTRODUCTION

If "The Lord" in Marc Connelly's play *The Green Pastures* were to tell a present-day preacher "Bein' God ain't no bed of roses," he might be surprised to hear the preacher reply, "Bein' preacher ain't no bed of roses either, Lawd." The preacher's eyes may be fixed upon the Promised Land, but his feet are in the dust of the desert.

It is a day of crisis! Skilled workmen return from the weary round of job-seeking, with empty hands and hopeless hearts, to the mortgaged home with its empty cupboards and hungry children. The preacher knows these people, and his heart is heavy. Students graduate from universities and join the trudging unemployed, who daily knock upon closed doors. Bruised knuckles, with consequent loss of a bit of blood, will heal; but bruised hearts, with resultant loss of self-respect, may never heal. The preacher urged these young people to attend college. In many cases it was he who secured the scholarships that made the education possible. He knows these students, and he wonders. Men, who were leaders in affairs financial, find themselves likewise broken upon the wheel. The preacher is called in to console parishioners who have had every comfort, but now lack the

bare necessities of life. He must encourage the strong but beaten man; he must bury the cowardly loser who has turned to the "easiest way out." The institution the preacher serves is in financial difficulties. His salary is but partially paid; his children may be denied the education he dreamed for them. It is indeed an hour of crisis! New races are struggling for their place in the sun. Ten million youths sleep quietly beneath the white crosses, while the nations in moronic worship offer up their sacrifices to Mars. Democracy falters. Dictatorship flourishes. It is a crucial hour! Is it not fitting that a Conference on Preaching should direct its attention to the problem of Preaching and the Social Crisis?

At the 1931 Conference on Preaching at the Boston University School of Theology, an attempt was made to present "The Varieties of Present-Day Preaching." Curiously enough, the attempt resulted in an amazing revelation of the essential oneness of the preaching objective and message. The Conference on Preaching and the Social Crisis, on the contrary, revealed striking differences of opinion. Capitalism was castigated by the preacher of communistic sympathies, and Communism was condemned by the priest of capitalistic persuasion. Some speakers believed that the preacher who adopts an economic "ism" as the means whereby the Kingdom is to be built, is in grave danger of becoming a propagandist for his particular "ism"

and a dogmatic persecutor of all other "isms," and by these very activities lose his rightful place as a voice of moral judgment and a herald of the new day. It was argued that the advocate cannot be the judge. Others seemed to believe that the clear-cut advocacy of Socialism was the preacher's duty. They argued that Socialism is motivated by forces that are much closer to the motivating element of Christianity than is capitalism. They insisted that the objectives of Socialism are far more in accord with the objectives of Christianity than are the goals of capitalism. They were not fearful of being called propagandists, preferring the term of reproach to a life of pedantic disputation over the merits of ritualism in worship or the place of the Gothic in the soul's search for God. They were promptly answered by men who are equally alive to the crisis, but who see the imperative necessity of revealing the Eternal Father through the teaching powers that lie in the beautiful service of worship. For these men the idea of God becomes both a unifying force and a beckoning truth. They would ground their advocacy of brotherhood in the nature of the universe, as seen in the conception of the Everlasting Father. "Preach the Word," they cried.

The following quotations reveal these differences in viewpoint. It is possible that the apparent divergencies may be reconciled if it be they are traced back to their source, since they tend to

converge, meeting at last in some of the fundamental propositions of Christianity—namely, that the universe is moral and personal, that at its heart is a God who will not be mocked, a colaborer with man, and that the supreme task of history is the enthronement of the will of this moral being in all the activities of man.

Professor Harry Frederick Ward declared, "I cannot conceive that the pastoral function of a church can possibly stop with trying to teach these people how to endure the disaster which has overwhelmed them. If we have no message to bring them concerning the way out, then the church will, before very long, fail to have any part in their lives." He insisted that the church must come to understand exactly what has happened, and argued that the beginning of the year 1930 closed a period in human history, that it "registered the fact for all the world that the capitalist system had passed the peak of its economic efficiency," and that in its day and generation, while it added great things to the record of the human race, now its hand has lost its cunning. "Its technique is no longer adequate to the situation in which man finds himself, and its human deficit is greater than its practical achievements." Hence he pointed out, "You will be faced, as preachers of the righteousness of the kingdom of God, with the necessity of deciding between the validity of these property values that have been piled up here in this period of so-called

prosperity and the necessities of these human lives. The whole question of what we call confiscation will become just as burning an issue for you as the question of confiscating the rights of the owners of slaves was for our grandfathers. Your gospel, if it is to have any place in modern society, will have to lead you and the people who sit under your preaching to take a stand upon that issue, not simply as a legal question, but one which touches the essence of the morality of the kingdom of God."

Professor Jerome Davis, discussing "Communism's Challenge to Christianity," after criticizing the dictatorship, denials of liberty and materialism of Communism, pointed out that Communism has possessed sensitivity to need, has made the needs of the underprivileged supreme, has been undaunted by obstacles, has refused to compromise on fundamentals, has stood for absolute racial equality, and for the necessity of sacrifice for the party. He suggested that the church might withdraw itself from the world, or conform to the state and the present economic order, or deliberately attempt to transform politics and the economic order.

In similar strain, Kirby Page said, "It is supremely tragic that at this late day evidence must still be produced that Socialism is much closer akin to the Christian gospel than capitalism." Continuing, he said, "Socialism differs radically from

capitalism at three most important points: For the motive of private gain it would substitute the dynamic of public service; instead of relying upon competition as a method, it would utilize co-operation; and the doctrine of *laissez faire* would be replaced by the concept of the state as a clearing house through which its citizens can pool their resources and energies for the realization of any legitimate end which can be accomplished most effectively in this way."

Fred Winslow Adams approached the crisis from another viewpoint, declaring, "Not in the course of justice, not in the course of Socialism or capitalism, or Communism or nationalism, Sovietism or individualism, Fascism, Hitlerism, or any other political or economic 'ism' shall we find salvation; save as in prayer, save as in common worship, save as in the spirit of Jesus, we learn to work out our own salvation in reverence and awe. Personal redemption is the unit of social redemption." He insisted that "until forms of worship have wings for social idealism the prophet's flight will be stalled. The vision of the prophet must be conserved in the liturgies of the priest if it is to be of abiding value. The whole emphasis of the social gospel, the new understanding of the ethic of Jesus, the labor movement, the peace movement and kindred civic, interracial and international movements have as yet little place in our liturgies, our symbolism, our rituals of worship. . . . If we

are to continue the use of creeds, why not affirmations we believe and understand, and which carry Jesus' emphasis of love? Do you realize that not a single historic creed of the church makes any mention of the all essential principle of love—neither the Athanasian, Nicene, nor Apostles', great intellectual formulations as these are? Why not, then, a creed declaring our faith in the love of God, and in the brotherhood of man?"

Dr. William Nelson DeBerry apparently was less interested in the unifying forces of worship than in the disuniting facts of the social life. Speaking for the Negro, he declared, "The Negro deplores in this connection the American custom of confusing social privileges and civil rights. Because of the bugbear and scarecrow of 'social equality' he is shorn of certain of his civil rights, the enjoyment of which would make him appear to be on a plane of social equality with those who are supposed to be his social superiors. On account of this unwarranted fear he is made to ride in Jim Crow cars and endure third-class accommodations while at the same time he is compelled to pay first-class fare. He is made to pay taxes for the maintenance and support of public parks, public libraries and other public institutions from the use of which he is rigidly excluded. In all this he must pay for certain privileges and be denied the right to enjoy them—an inalienable right of every human being and a civil right of every American citizen. Taxa-

tion without representation is as unjust to-day as it was a hundred and fifty years ago when Patrick Henry first uttered this immortal dictum. It always has been and it always will be unjust."

Bishop Francis John McConnell's mind penetrated to the heart of the question of worship when he said: "There is at the present time in this country a tendency in the direction of mysticism. We assume that a man who has a mystic experience necessarily has a Christian experience, but he may not at all, even though mysticism is common to religions the world over. . . . The remarkable thing about the Old and New Testament is that all the mysticism is joined to the recognition of human values together with a recognition of divine values, and comes out of a moral purpose and leads on to a moral outcome." He showed, therefore, throughout his entire address that there is danger that the two commandments of the Lord which for him were one may fall apart in these days: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. . . . And with all thy strength: this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." They must be kept together in the thinking of the preacher. Worship must eventuate in moral activity; but moral activity finds its true source in a moral God.

Merton Stacher Rice poignantly cried: "Oh

preacher! preacher! What have you to offer such an age as this? Is there any convincing reason why we should not be reckoned nonessential and set aside? These are practical days; are we practical men?" In the idea of God, as revealed in Christ, he found the answer to the basic needs of man, whether in crisis or calm.

Charles Wesley Burns turned to the personal emphasis and declared, "Any movement that will redeem society, any program for the salvation of the race, any scheme for the uplift of humanity, any plan for world brotherhood, any system of social justice, any solution of industrial maladjustment, must be born of a motive that reaches men's hearts and changes their lives. The salvation of society is in direct ratio to the salvation of individuals who compose society. The redemption of the race is dependent upon the redemption of the units who compose the race." Edwin Holt Hughes discusses the difficult theme, "Preaching and Prohibition" with singular effectiveness.

Dr. Burris Atkins Jenkins addressed himself to the topic "Preaching and Personal Problems" in an intensely practical way. Fully cognizant as he is of the struggle in which the world finds itself at the moment, he knows that major struggles are, after all, in the minds and hearts of individuals. Out of an extraordinarily rich experience he came to the conclusion that "The real preacher, after all, con-

cerns himself pre-eminently with people—his books only a means to that end. He will not find his accessibility a burden, however the long series of conferences may weary him, if he bears in mind that he lives to minister, but will go home, it may be physically jaded, but none the less compensated. . . . He will walk into hospitals and sick-rooms with an added sympathy and efficiency. He will even rejoice with them that do rejoice with a deeper sincerity and sense of relief and congratulation. He will take all the problems that come to him, economic, marital, parental, punitive, with a healing understanding that grows wider with the years and deal with them with a more practiced hand; and the marvel of the Master's magic touch, so full of healing, will grow greater and more satisfying in his own soul, as the best guerdon of all his toil."

Professor William Leroy Stidger found the social message of Jesus in the poetry of Edwin Markham, and Rabbi Stephen Wise, who was unable to prepare his address for this volume, discussed the theme "The Preacher and Politics," arguing that the preacher cannot keep out of politics, but must be in it until the morality of his religion is the morality that rules political life.

In these lectures, men of penetrating intellect, wide experience, and sincere purpose discuss certain phases of the theme "Preaching and the Social

Crisis." In an hour of crisis it is quite natural that the addresses should differ widely in viewpoint. It is equally understandable that the element of fear should bulk large in them. It may be well for preachers and laymen, too, to remember that the God of our fathers has seen his children face many a crisis since Calvary. The Tomb has never held the Christ. He has arisen again and again. It is not too much to hope that the dream of John may yet come true and Jesus shall become the ruler of the kings of the earth. Nations rise and fall; civilizations come and go; but man marches on, beaten but unbowed, ever on, in the belief that eventually the will of God will be done on earth as it is done in heaven. He will emerge, think many, from the present struggle, and in the very emergence may prove the truth of Thomas Carlyle's penetrating prophecy:

"We must some day, at last and forever, cross the line between Nonsense and Common Sense. And on that day we shall pass from Class Paternalism, originally derived from fetish fiction in times of universal ignorance, to Human Brotherhood in accordance with the nature of things and our growing knowledge of it; from Political Government to Industrial Administration; from Competition in Individualism to Individuality in Co-operation; from War and Despotism, in any form, to Peace and Liberty."

Is it too great an act of faith to believe that as a result of the struggle man will be stronger and ready for the undreamed crises with which the oncoming centuries will confront him?

G. Bromley Oxnam.

THE LECTURES PRESENTED IN THIS VOLUME WERE DELIVERED BY

Kirby Page, Editor of The World To-morrow.

Jerome Davis, Yale University, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Religion and Labor Movement.

Harry Frederick Ward, Professor of Christian Ethics at Union Theological Seminary.

William Nelson DeBerry, Director of the Dunbar Community League of Springfield, Massachusetts.

G. Bromley Oxnam, President of DePauw University.

Francis John McConnell, a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Burris Atkins Jenkins, Minister of the Community Church, Kansas City, Missouri.

Charles Wesley Burns, a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Fred Winslow Adams, Professor of Worship and the Pastoral Office, Boston University School of Theology.

Merton Stacher Rice, Pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church, Detroit, Michigan.

William Leroy Stidger, Professor of Homiletics in the Boston University School of Theology.

Edwin Holt Hughes, a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

PREACHING AND SOCIALISM

KIRBY PAGE

IT is supremely tragic that at this late day evidence must still be produced that Socialism is much closer akin to the Christian gospel than capitalism. During these terrible times our energies should be devoted to social planning and the perfecting of measures of social control rather than to controversies concerning the necessity for collective action.

With more than ten million breadwinners looking in vain for employment in this country, and not less than twenty-five million persons living in households that lack even the bare necessities of life, the breakdown of individualism is recorded in letters of blood. Not only are hunger and starvation staring multitudes in the face; class war and world war are hovering as terrifying possibilities.

For the Christian Church to disentangle itself from the meshes of capitalism is as crucial and urgent in our time as it was for the church of our forefathers' day to break with slavery, serfdom, and the doctrine of the divine right of kings. The ship of capitalism is sinking and will carry down all institutions that fasten themselves like barnacles to its hulk. To us it seems almost incredible

that wise and good men should ever have regarded chattel slavery as a beneficent and divine institution. Yet generations that live after us will look back with similar amazement upon the complacent acceptance of capitalism by many religious people of our day. The intolerable nature of the system of individualism is revealed not alone in a period of depression with its accompanying misery, but is inherent in its constituent elements.

To convict men of sin and secure repentance, to arouse and inspire them by holding up noble ideals, to point the way to a realization of these ideals and thus hasten the coming of the Family of God—these are primary functions of preaching. Penitence, aspiration, and hope must be engendered in those persons who are to become worthy co-operators in building the new society.

Sin is any attitude or practice which debases personality, embitters human relations, and separates man from God. This is an inadequate definition, of course, and requires qualification, but it may serve as a basis for the present discussion. It is obvious that there are two general types of sin: those emerging from individual, man-to-man contacts, and those arising out of group or mass relations. Corporate sins are those in which men are involved as members of a group, class, nation, or race. As civilization becomes complex in its nature and titanic in its dimensions, the impersonal aspects of life become increasingly dominant.

An ever larger proportion of our conduct is determined by the decisions of organized groups, some of which are far distant from us; while as members of various corporate bodies we in turn profoundly affect the welfare of innumerable persons we have never seen. Few of the citizens of Berlin were individual sinners against the people of Paris, yet the corporate sins of Germany and France were monstrous. Not many residents of the United States desire to injure the people of Japan, but the corporate decision of Congress to administer a direct insult by excluding the Japanese altogether, rather than to place them on a quota basis with other nations, created intense bitterness.

In the economic realm, however, are to be found the greatest number and widest variety of collective sins. In this fertile field, men "sin by syndicate," to use an illuminating phrase coined by Professor E. A. Ross. And since wholesale sinning is deadlier than retail sinning, it is imperative that we understand the nature of modern industrialism, especially those aspects of the productive and distributive system which thwart and destroy personality, disrupt and poison human relations, and deaden man's spiritual heritage.

The present economic order—individualism or capitalism or the profit system—rests upon three corner stones. Self-interest is assumed to be a necessary motivation; competition is considered an efficient and beneficial method; and, in accordance

with the theory of *laissez faire*, the government is supposed to stay out of business, being responsible only for preserving the peace and compelling the observance of the rules of the game. After two centuries of operation, this social system can now be tested by its fruits.

The first evil result of individualism which I desire to stress is the accentuation of covetousness, greed, and materialism which it has produced. It is one thing to say that covetousness is undesirable but ineradicable, and another to say that covetousness is beneficial and should be encouraged. Advocates of capitalism have usually taken the latter position and have maintained that enlightened self-interest is the most dynamic instrument of social progress. In the early stages of the new system this idea was phrased with more clarity and enthusiasm than during these latter days when capitalism has been under fire. The famous clergyman Malthus put it this way: "By making the passion of self-love beyond comparison stronger than the passion of benevolence, the more ignorant are led to pursue the general happiness, an end which they would have totally failed to attain if the moving principle of their conduct had been benevolence." An ordained ancestor of J. P. Morgan once exclaimed: "Each man coveting to make himself rich carries on the Publick Good: Thus God in His Wisdom and Mercy turns our Wickedness to Publick Benefit. . . . A rich Man

is a great friend of the Publick, while he aims at nothing but serving himself. God will have us live by helping one another; and since Love will not to do, Covetousness shall."

While such shocking language is no longer used in the pulpit, modern pews are filled with church members whose acceptance of covetousness is no less ardent in fact if more restrained in expression. A double standard of motives prevails throughout Christendom. Missionaries, clergymen, and members of certain other professions are supposed to be motivated by the passion to serve, to relieve, and to redeem humanity, and not to be concerned primarily with their personal comfort and safety. If a missionary should announce publicly that he is guided by self-interest, and that his chief purpose in going to Africa is to provide adequately for himself and his family, he would create a seven days' sensation. Yet it is generally assumed that Christian business men are justified in living luxuriously if they can afford it, and such persons are likely to become objects of envy and emulation. A generalization is warranted to the effect that if a rich layman contributes generously to the church and attends its services with regularity, his voice is likely to become dominant in its councils, although he may spend six days a week in a fiercely competitive struggle for private gain and may reside in an expensive mansion and be ministered unto by many servants. That is to say, selfishness on the

part of a clergyman is condemned, while covetousness on the part of a layman receives the applause and approbation of the community. Thus our society says to its youth by the manner in which its chief awards are made: "To be successful in the struggle for privilege and power, be covetous—and generous!"

A second evil of individualism is found in the prevailing extremes of wealth and poverty. Under the play of self-interest and competition, the fortunate few accumulate far more than they need or are able to utilize, while vast multitudes dwell in destitution and misery. The width of the chasm between the rich and the poor is revealed by the income tax returns for prosperous 1929. In that year the number of incomes in the United States of $25,000 and above was 102,578, and the total tax paid by this group was 928 million dollars, out of 1,001 millions paid into the treasury by all persons in the country. That is to say, less than one seventh of one per cent of the adult population paid ninety-two per cent of the income tax! In normal years only three or four adults out of a hundred pay any income tax whatever. Even in the prosperous year 1920, when a single person was required to file a return if his income was as high as $1,000, or $2,000 for a married person, only 7,259,944 returns were filed, and of these only 5,518,310 were taxable—or less than nine per cent of the adult population.

The skimming off the cream by the privileged class has not only resulted in illimitable wealth for some and dire poverty for many, it has utterly demoralized the productive and distributive system by creating a surplus of producers' capital and a shortage of consumers' capital. That is to say, far more money is available for investment in new plants and equipment than can possibly be utilized, the government of this country being able to borrow on short term notes at one seventh of one per cent interest, while at the same time numberless consumers are unable to purchase the bare necessities of life. A more equitable distribution of the proceeds of industry is demanded not only by justice but by economic efficiency. In spite of the fact that capitalism in the United States has had a virgin continent to exploit and has had at its disposal technological processes of surpassing efficiency, and has enabled a few thousand families to grow fabulously rich, it has never provided a decent livelihood for the masses, and intermittently in periods of depression it has plunged millions of workers into destitution and hunger.

Competition for private gain inevitably creates strife and hostility. As the frontier vanishes and free land is exhausted, the struggle for personal possessions becomes increasingly destructive. The strain upon business men is terrific, and the number of commercial failures in this country exceeds twenty thousand annually, with incalculable mis-

ery for those involved. A much larger number of manufacturers and merchants constantly hover on the brink of failure and are cruelly victimized by insecurity. Suicide has become appallingly frequent. During last year in the United States there was a suicide every twenty-six minutes, night and day throughout the twelve months.

With the passing of the handicraft era and the emergence of mass production, workers have for the most part ceased to own their own tools and are dependent for a livelihood upon their ability to find employment from the owning class. Even in prosperous years upward of a million men are constantly unemployed, and during a terrible crisis as at present more than ten millions are looking in vain for work. The struggle of worker against worker for a job has assumed ghastly intensity.

Under the profit system the intensification of the class struggle is inevitable. As the size of the industrial units grows more titanic and the division of labor more minute, the impotence of the individual becomes more apparent and the necessity for collective action more urgent. The lines are thus drawn tighter, and class consciousness and class action tend to submerge the individual employer or worker. Class hostility and class warfare emerge automatically in a society which sanctifies self-interest and blesses competition. Bloody evidence is to be found strewn along the highways of industrial and mining communities

throughout the nation. Harlan County, Kentucky, and Mingo County, West Virginia, are only two of the numerous regions in this country where for decades civil war has raged intermittently.

If covetousness is respectable, it is natural that greed and ruthlessness should characterize the conduct of men who struggle in the industrial and financial arena, and that the result should be a battlefield. And if individuals, corporations, and other economic groupings within a country follow the law of the jungle, nations will themselves do likewise. And so nationalism is the world-wide counterpart of individualism in the local industrial sphere. National covetousness and greed are metamorphosed into patriotic loyalty, and thus the citizens of the respective nations consider it their duty to rush madly toward the precipice of war.

Surely it is high time, then, to search diligently for an alternative economic system. Capitalism is now confronted with three dynamic rivals: Fascism, Communism, and Socialism. Just here we may quickly dispose of the first, as it retains many of the evils of our present system and creates additional ones of its own. Communism is being interpreted in other addresses of this series, and I will not do more than emphasize the major difference—not the only one—between Communism and Socialism. It may be advisable to point out that Communism is a form of Socialism, and that com-

munists frequently refer to themselves as socialists. But the methods of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia, and other members of the Third International, differ drastically from those of the Socialist Party of the United States and the British Labour Party. The former are committed to violent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, while the latter repudiate violent class war and rely upon economic and political pressure.

Socialism differs radically from capitalism at the three most important points: for the motive of private gain, it would substitute the dynamic of public service; instead of relying upon competition as a method, it would utilize co-operation; and the doctrine of *laissez faire* would be replaced by the concept of the state as a clearing house through which its citizens can pool their resources and energies for the realization of any legitimate end which can be accomplished most effectively in this way.

Socialism is predicated upon the belief that normal men will respond to nonfinancial incentives if they are subjected to proper stimuli. The wartime experience of the race is illuminating in this connection. Under the stress and danger of war, men exert themselves more vigorously than at any other time, four motives combining to produce an extraordinary release of energy. The first is patriotic zeal, genuine devotion to country and passionate eagerness to be of service. Second, the

desire to win public approval, in the form of a medal for heroism or a citation for sacrificial relief of a comrade, or public applause for efficient service as a dollar-a-year-man. Third, desire to avoid public disapproval as a slacker or deserter. Fourth, fear of official penalties for refusing to obey orders or to carry a full share of the load.

To maintain that Socialists are mistaken in their belief that men will respond to the appeal of public service is not only to fly in the face of experience but is also a flagrant denial of the validity of the Christian gospel. Jesus never invited men to come unto him in order that they might secure wealth or luxury or safety. On the contrary, he constantly warned his followers against the cancer of covetousness. The self-centered young ruler was told to sell his all and give to the poor if he would find the way of life. With Jesus it was a deep conviction that men cannot serve both God and money. His followers are to seek first and always the kingdom of God and to have no anxiety about their physical needs. "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." "Blessed are you when they have insulted and persecuted you, and have said every cruel thing about you falsely for my sake. Be joyful and triumphant, because your reward is great in the Heavens; for so were the Prophets before you persecuted."

Progressively and as rapidly as possible, so-

cialism would eliminate competition for private gain, and substitute co-operative endeavors in a common cause. Just as competition for private profit has been abandoned in the post office, the government printing office, public bridges and canals, municipal power plants and water works, and in many countries in railways, telephones, and telegraphs, Socialists propose that private profit should be abolished progressively from the major means of production and distribution. Why should a few thousand families own and exploit for their own enrichment the coal mines and other irreplaceable minerals and natural resources of the land? Socialists maintain that these priceless resources should be owned by the public and operated without private profit by those most highly qualified to carry on these enterprises. In the case of the coal mines, the board of control and operation should consist of engineers, selected by the national society of engineers; miners, selected by their national trade union; and consumers, elected by the national co-operative society, or in the meantime appointed by the President of the United States. And so in turn with water power, railways, communications, oil, other natural resources, various heavy industries, and banking. That the land should be owned by the state and made available to the people for their use rather than to be manipulated for private gain, is a basic conviction with Socialists.

Socialism alone makes possible adequate social planning. Individualism is a negation of planned production, since under its sway every man and every corporation is free to produce whatever can be sold at a profit, subject only to the restrictions demanded by the police function. If the coal mines were owned and operated by the public, it would be possible to estimate accurately the amount of coal required and to place it on the market at cost, after having paid reasonable wages to the miners, engineers, and other employees. When the major means of production and distribution are publicly owned and operated, it will then be possible to plan production in such a way as to eliminate the cataclysmic business cycles and periods of depression and to stabilize employment. Of course there are enormous difficulties involved in transforming the anarchistic production of capitalism into the orderly production of a socialistic commonwealth. But in this direction alone is there hope of creating an equitable society.

In contrast with Communists, Socialists believe that it is possible to create the new society without violence. They emphasize the necessity of a triple organization—of workers in trade union, of consumers in co-operative societies, and of voters in a Socialist party. By this combination it will be possible without violence to revolutionize the distribution of privilege and power. The risks of industry should be pooled and social insurance

provided, covering health, accidents, old age, maternity, and unemployment. More and more advantages and facilities in the realms of education, art, music, and recreation should be made available to the masses at public cost. Taxation should be regarded as an instrument of social policy and used deliberately to bring about a more equitable division of wealth and income. The income tax, the inheritance tax, the excess profits tax, and luxury taxes are all legal and may be used rigorously when public opinion is favorable.

Surely, it is obvious that the co-operative method of Socialism is much closer akin to Jesus' way of life than is the competitive combat of capitalism. A simple test will make this fact vividly clear: When the kingdom of God comes on earth, after centuries of praying and suffering, will the various members of God's Home be motivated by self-interest and engage with each other in a ruthless competitive struggle for the comforts and privileges of the new society? Any man in his right mind will recognize the incongruity of covetousness and greed and strife with the spirit of Christ.

Too many Christians of this generation have been doing obeisance to the golden calf Efficiency; bowing down to capitalism and glorying in its greed and combat. But is quantity of production a satisfactory criterion of a social system? Suppose it could be proved, as multitudes of wise men long

thought, that chattel slavery alone can secure maximum production and the highest standard of living; and assume furthermore that the slaves are able to enjoy more comforts and luxuries than they would be able to secure as free men, would these facts constitute a justification of slavery?

Even if it could be demonstrated that capitalism is able to produce the greatest quantity of goods with the least human effort—and this demonstration is increasingly difficult to make—the system of individualism as it has been known in the United States would still be irreconcilable with the religion of Jesus. No matter how much energy is released and how many commodities are produced, greed is greed, and strife is strife, and can never be made compatible with the Family of God on earth. And to continue to bestow one's blessing upon capitalism after its inability to provide even the simple necessities for its people has been so tragically demonstrated, and after it has scattered powder mines recklessly over the earth, thereby threatening to destroy civilization with another great war—to continue longer to sanction capitalism is to add mental dullness to spiritual blindness.

And so preaching must come to grips with capitalism and Socialism. All great revivals of religion have been preceded by deep conviction of sin, and this generation cannot be saved unless it brings forth fruits of repentance. The true minis-

ter of Christ will awaken his people to a realization of the monstrous collective sins in which they are implicated, and will summon them one and all to the mourner's bench.

If sin is an attitude or practice which debases personality, embitters human relations, and separates man from God—then a comprehensive list of contemporary sinners must include: business men who are motivated by covetousness, and who seek to justify their greed by praising enlightened self-interest; merchants and manufacturers who climb to privilege and power over the broken bodies of their competitors; directors whose chief concern is dividends for themselves, and who are therefore constantly endeavoring to reduce wages and to raise prices; investors who dwell in ease and luxury from unearned increment derived from cruel exploitation of women and children; tariff manipulators who for their own enrichment seek power to extract exorbitant prices from consumers; citizens engaged in foreign trade who demand armed intervention by the marines, even at the risk of bloodshed and war; seekers of special privilege who corrupt public officials; mine operators who perpetuate their feudalistic domination by suppressing workers' organizations; trade unionists who betray their comrades by accepting graft; financiers who poison the public mind through a subsidized press; consumers who purchase in the lowest market, oblivious or indifferent

to the fact that commodities are often covered with the blood of sweated laborers; trustees of educational institutions who victimize professors because they present unpopular truths that threaten special privileges; educators of timid and craven spirit, who hypocritically teach what they do not believe, and who hide their real convictions because they fear consequences; church officials who seek to silence the prophetic voice when it disturbs or threatens vested interests; clergymen who permit their vision to grow dim, their zeal to flag, and their courage to ooze away; conservatives who seek to perpetuate their own power by vilifying their opponents; radicals who intolerantly denounce all who disagree with them, and who permit themselves to become embittered; liberals who foolishly put their faith in poultices when a major amputation is needed; cynics who whine, "You cannot change human nature," and who glorify the greed and strife of capitalism; Christians of little faith and faint heart who refuse to take seriously the challenge of their Lord to build the new society here and now. "If we say, 'We are not guilty,' we are deceiving ourselves and the truth is not in us."

To convict men of sin and secure repentance, to arouse and inspire them by holding up noble ideals, to point the way to a realization of these ideals and thus hasten the coming of the Family of God—these are primary functions of preaching.

Penitence, aspiration and hope must be engendered in those persons who are to become worthy co-operators in building the new society. Effective preaching in this day will expose the collective sins of greed and strife, and will illumine the way to co-operative service for the common good. When we pray, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth," we are praying for the transformation of capitalism into a co-operative commonwealth.

COMMUNISM'S CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY

JEROME DAVIS

COMMUNISM is a challenge and a warning. It challenges us by the strength of its loyalties and the daring of its goals. It warns us by its intolerance, by its dictatorial harshness, and by its bitter hostility to religion.

In presenting this topic I am not blind to these faults, but of greater implication for us is the positive challenge of Communism. The most effective preaching is not an oral message but a life of service and sacrifice for the common good. I am aware of the thousands of ministers in this country who are giving their lives in unselfish devotion for their faith. If my address seems critical I hope you will remember that I do realize the heroism of much that you are doing.

After studying the Communist movement for over sixteen years, I think there are certain fundamental lessons the church can learn from it. In the first place, the Communist leaders have a *sensitivity to need*. Long before the World War they saw the desperate plight of the Russian masses. They felt in all its stark brutal ugliness the common exploitation of man by man. They

determined not only to oppose the Tsar but to oppose capitalism, to put an end to the profit motivation and to secure the social ownership of the basic means of production and distribution. The Communist leaders declare that Western democracy is a sham democracy, that in reality it is controlled by the few for the profit of an aristocracy of property. They will have none of it. They demand a dictatorship of producers. They believe it is possible to own, control, and use all property for the benefit of the workers through a system of state Socialism. Nothing must be run for the profit of the individual; everything must be run in the interests of the masses—the real producers. Production must be for use and not for profit. Furthermore, they demand that all property relations be humanized; that we must revolutionize factory conditions in the interests of the workers. All income must be socialized. The effort of everyone in society shall be planned and directed for the common good. The Western world has hardly sensed at all the spiritual values of Communism which have ethically far outdistanced the patterns of behavior of much of our own economic order. The Russian leaders sensed the needs of the peasants and the workers and are creating a planned economic order to serve them. American church leaders would do well to heed the lesson of *sensitivity to need.*

In the second place, the Communists made the

needs of the underprivileged supreme. They championed the most downward group, realizing that if conditions for the least privileged could be made satisfactory, all of society would be reasonably healthy. Perhaps America needs this note. What are our churches doing for organized labor? What are we doing about such a measure as unemployment insurance, for instance? Communism has organized trade unions everywhere and has protected the workers by social insurance. Should not our churches become temples for the underprivileged rather than monuments to piety, pride, and privilege?

In the third place, the Communists striving for their radical goal were *undaunted by obstacles* no matter how great. Perhaps I can best illustrate this and the other two points already made by my own experience under the Tsar in 1916. I was assigned to aid one hundred and sixty thousand prisoners of war in Turkestan. The first prison I worked in was called the "Death Camp" of Turkestan. There I found seventy-five dying a day from spotted typhus. The commander of the camp was a fine Russian officer but he was totally unaware of the day-by-day needs of the prisoners. He wanted to make a record for economy and was spending only a few cents a day per prisoner for food. The water was brought in through an irrigation ditch and was not boiled. As a result scurvy, dysentery, typhoid, and other diseases

were taking their daily toll. In the near-by city of Tashkent the bankers, the merchants, and the teachers were totally unaware of the conditions at the death camp. The clergy might as well have been in the Sahara Desert as far as helping these underprivileged men was concerned. When I became interested in the Russian soldiers, I found their condition deplorable. They received only twenty-five cents a month in pay and were treated almost like cattle. When I asked if we could build a Y. M. C. A. hut for them, I was told by a Tsar's general that I didn't understand the Russian soldiers, that they were nothing but peasants, that they liked these conditions, and if I wanted to help anyone I should work for the officers. In industry men were working twelve hours a day for seven days a week at a wage of fifteen dollars a month. Organization was forbidden and except for the revolutionists nobody protested.

Think of the obstacles confronting the small band of Communists who wanted to change conditions such as these. All the forces of law and order and economic privilege were stacked against them. The revolutionists were outlawed and hunted down. They repeatedly experienced prison, exile, and even death. In spite of it all they were undaunted. People said their cause was hopeless and it would be decades, if not centuries, before the Tsar would be overthrown, yet within a few months of this time the Communists were in control.

After I had worked in Russia for nearly three years I came back to the United States. I was asked to make a study of the Russian immigrants for the Interchurch World Movement. This took me to the various industrial centers where the marginal workers were employed. In Pittsburgh I found men working twelve hours a day for seven days a week. They complained bitterly. One declared, "What crime have I committed that I should be compelled to live like this?" I found that the bankers, the merchants, and the teachers of Pittsburgh were indifferent to this condition. The churches of Pittsburgh might as well have been in the Sahara Desert as far as knowing or doing anything about these conditions was concerned. When the representatives of the Interchurch World Movement from outside Pittsburgh went to Judge Gary, the head of the steel corporation, and asked him to abolish the twelve hour day, he refused.

The difference between conditions in the United States and the conditions under the Tsar have much in common. It is a difference in the degree of injustice, not so much a difference in kind.

Russia faced a Tsar's autocracy in which human rights were largely ignored. America faces an industrial autocracy in which the right of labor to organize is often bitterly opposed. Not long ago a research study at Harvard investigated the sub-

ject of *What the Employer Thinks*. Here are some of the statements about American conditions:

Industry is divided into two camps—that of management and that of men.

The denial of a worker's capacity to feel, think, and grow strikes a severe blow at democratic government.

Practically no executive avowed his obligation for the conscious and definite development of his workers.

So far the public, in opposing autocratic industry, has done little more than have a vague resentment against general conditions.

In the face of such conditions have the churches been sensitive to the need, have they made the needs of the underprivileged supreme? Listen to the answer of the Springfield Church Survey:

There is a distressing lack in Springfield Protestantism of deliberate and recognized contact with modern industrial problems. No church is thought of as particularly interested in the realm of labor problems, or as distinctively and consistently applying its gospel to the outstanding issues of industrial justice and peace. . . . Protestantism is geographically unbalanced. Its affinities are shamefully with the more prosperous part of the population, and it has run away from the poor and needy.

The Saint Louis church survey and that of Middletown confirm these findings. A prominent Yale millionaire has this to say: "We church people are living lives so isolated and segregated from the teeming streams of life activities that we do not realize what the masses are dreaming or

thinking about. As to the class consciousness of the church, it is enough to call attention to the location in which she builds, the almost complete absences on her boards of representatives of the labor unions." He goes on to say that in order to win labor the church will first of all have to declass herself.

The churches are face to face with injustice all about them. Not only has there been a lack of sensitivity to the needs of the underprivileged, but there has been an unconscious tendency for churches to play safe, to be tactful in the face of the power of economic privilege.

A fourth lesson we can learn from the Communists is that they *refused to compromise on fundamentals.* They stood like a rock against the respectable evils of the state and the economic order under the Tsar. If the Tsar declared war, they opposed the conflict. If he accorded the people a Duma, they refused to accept this as a substitute for the complete abolition of the autocracy. Never at any point did they acquiesce in the evils of capitalism or permit themselves to be engineered into a position where anyone could believe that they supported the capitalistic system. This could hardly be claimed for the American church. An article about skyscraper churches in the New York *Times*, written just before the Wall Street crash, is headed "More Churches Built for Profit." To-day some churches are paying the price of their alliance

with capitalism in the form of mortgages, foreclosures, and spiritual atrophy.

The profit motivation is anathema to Communism. A man can seek to amass wealth for himself; but if he does, he is a social traitor and a moral leper in the new Russian world. It is easy for us to look at Russia across an Atlantic Ocean of fog and propaganda, but it is possible she may be right in her attack on the profit motivation. Her leaders believe that the profit motive is of the devil and that a society can actually be built which "gives to each according to his need and takes from each according to his ability."

I once tested the attitudes of hundreds of Communist school children in Moscow, asking them to rank various occupations according to their prestige or social standing. The private entrepreneur, the banker, and the clergyman ranked last and the worker first. In America similar tests have shown that the ratio is just reversed, with the banker first.

Communism challenges Christianity by its uncompromising attack on capitalism. It indicts the present methods of production and of distribution. It believes that capitalistic civilization is poisoned with the toxins of acquisitiveness. It does not hesitate to condemn this system and the selfish methods which are inherent in it by every means at its command. In Russia every effort is made to make people feel that anyone who goes out for

money is a traitor and a moral hypocrite. The only justification for any profession or business is service to the group. The rules of the social order are so constructed that no one is given preferred status except from principle. Differences in compensation are relatively slight.

In America the church finds itself immersed in a capitalistic civilization. Its membership is made up of those who are beneficiaries of the existing economic structure. It is hesitant if not fearful to attack the evils of this order. Why should not American churches embellish their walls with this cryptic sentence from the great religious leader, Saint Jerome, "Opulence is the result of theft; if not committed by the actual possessor, then by his predecessor"? To ask the question is to answer it. It would seem sacrilegious to the property-minded board of trustees. Communism is a warning and a challenge. If the church remains silent in the face of great economic wrong, it cannot permanently endure. A ministry which becomes tainted by silently acquiescing in economic practices which are unethical can never be effective in remaking our civilization.

No one can deny the evils of capitalism. We are confronted with over eleven millions of unemployed. Prior to 1929 we experienced an orgy of speculation and gambling encouraged by the banks and leaders of state. Since then five thousand banks have crashed with the loss of millions of

dollars belonging to the working class. We have been victimized by financial racketeers. Even today most of us are probably paying three times too much for electric light. A single number of the magazine *Time* reveals flashes of business morality. Besides mention of Henry M. Blackmer, fugitive from the Teapot Dome scandal, there is the story of the flight of Samuel Insull, of electric limelight, and an account of the indictment of one of our best banking houses. The minister does not need to be an expert to know that we must reshape our economic order.

If we are to accept the challenge of Communism, we must *refuse to compromise* on the issue of justice and righteousness. We must ever preach our opposition to the established order and things as they are. In fact, we must fearlessly preach the *doom of the existing order*. Banks must again become institutions whose sole purpose is to safeguard the money of depositors. Banking affiliates must be abolished and in the end some form of insurance of deposits will probably come.

A fifth lesson which the church might learn from Communism is absolute racial equality. In the case of subject nationalities this means cultural autonomy. Schools can be run in the language of each subject group. America on the other hand compels the Philippines to conduct schools in English. The Communists tolerate no racial discrimination towards the Negro. Two American

engineers who showed racial discourtesy were actually expelled from Russia. The American church should champion the rights of the Negro and welcome him into its fellowship at every point if it is to be true to the religion of Jesus.

Perhaps the supreme lesson which can be learned from the experience of the Communists is an old one, namely, *the necessity to sacrifice for our faith*, to live the creed we profess, to hold aloft the banner of poverty, sacrifice, and suffering for a cause. The Founder of our faith himself paid the supreme sacrifice. Yet these noble doctrines have been transmuted into a ministry of comfort in which our preaching ministry itself lives according to the standards of the congregation it serves. The minister of a wealthy congregation lives in relative abundance. Those who minister to a less prosperous group must restrict their expenditures, but few can be said to be sharing the lot of the underprivileged, unless forced to do so by economic necessity.

The leaders of Communism, on the other hand, have experienced the tyranny of the Tsar's regime. They know what it is to have nowhere to lay their heads. They understand from experience what it means to be hungry. They are willing to sacrifice their daily comforts, even their lives if need be, for the Communist cause. Too many preachers sacrifice only by proxy or by oratory. They preach Christ crucified and live contented lives of relative

comfort. Kagawa of Japan says that in America he found the preachers contented—and "You can't build the religion of Jesus on contentment." We must again make Christianity a religion of adventure, not of assent to a creed. If Christianity is to endure, it must shed the contagion of sacrifice actually transmuted into the lives of its followers. No prophetic preaching ministry can teach this lesson to mankind unless its leaders themselves are at the forefront of sacrificial living.

Communists have gloried in giving their lives for a cause. Too often our American church has gloried in being so respectable that it could build beautiful temples costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. Deep in our hearts we know that insight into the Divine comes pre-eminently from sacrifice for humanity. Every reform, every great revolutionary change has come because men have sacrificed for a cause. One of the greatest dangers confronting the church is that its ministry may live contentedly, complacently, conventionally. For, in spite of low salaries and genuine hardships, ministers may still live in relative comfort ignoring the fundamental bases of our social ills and refusing to sacrifice in an unpopular cause. Kagawa in Japan lived in the slums with his wife in a single room six foot square for years. When ministers once sense the full implication of the tragedy all about them and the terrific necessity of sacrifice, they will be willing to reduce their expenses

materially even if it means going about in a car costing only a few dollars or cutting down on luxuries in food. If the ministers of America would sacrifice through their income to the uttermost, we could increase one hundredfold the work now being done for economic justice. Every minister must be willing to risk the loss of his position if that is necessary in the great revolutionary cause of Christ.

Communism also challenges us by its denials. Communism denies the possibility of peaceful evolution and denies civil liberties to its opponents. Communism preaches the necessity of violent revolution. Christians believe in theory that peaceful evolution must be substituted for violence. At present these are mere pious opinions that are violated in every country wherever and whenever war is declared. No religion could have more vigorously defended a policy of violence than did the churches of the United States in the late World War. So vigorous was this nationalistic spirit that as a vestige of it we find American flags in almost every pulpit in the land. At the great Peace Conference we find the atheist government of Soviet Russia standing at the forefront in demanding complete military disarmament, and it is the Christian nation of America that has most vigorously blocked any concrete move in that direction. To be sure, President Hoover finally proposed a substantial reduction in armament, but

he did so only after the American delegation had repeatedly voted against every proposal of a similar nature which emanated from the Russians. And in the final closing hours of the Peace Conference, when the Russians moved an amendment providing for the very principle which President Hoover stood for, it remained for the American delegation to vote against it. The American people cannot rely on a policy of peaceful evolution unless it provides some technique for peace. It must face some such questions as these: How is it possible to reduce to equality a privileged class which ceases to merit its privileges without civil war? How can a wealthy class which no longer deserves its wealth be shorn of its riches without violence? How can we recognize the parasitic class when it exists? How can the minister guard himself against the danger of becoming a beneficiary of a parasitic group without realizing to whom he is obligated? Precisely what are the causes of repression which exist in our own social structure?

If the church is ethically to oppose violent revolution, it must make itself responsible for peaceful evolution. This demands among other things absolute insistence on freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of assemblage, even in times of strikes and social conflict. As religious leaders we always pride ourselves on championing freedom of speech, but this abstraction is meaningless, as

Justice Holmes has said, unless we permit freedom for the opinion we hate. How many ministers make it part of their prophetic ministry to champion the rights of Communists to parade, to present petitions of grievance to the mayor, to assemble and voice their grievances? Most churches have done little or nothing even to make possible freedom for labor union supporters in conflict zones.

It should be part of the task of a prophetic ministry to discover new techniques of preaching. The free forum is one technique which has proved its usefulness over the years. It is possible that another technique may be to assist the organized forces of labor to have educational classes and educational forums in their own trade union halls. In New Haven we assist all the trade unions in conducting a forum every month in their own Trades Council hall. Undoubtedly, the church should support liberal and radical organizations which are standing for social and economic justice. It is a striking fact at the present time that the church is doing very much less in the economic area than it is in the field of peace.

Communism denies the validity of God and of religion. The Bolsheviks center their attack on two counts: first, that religion spreads superstition, and, second, that it has always been used by a privileged minority to exploit the masses of the people. This challenge can only be met by an ethical religion which is serving the common

people. There is a real danger that the God of the churches will be made into harmony with the dominant practices of the state and the economic order. We have only to refer to such a case as that of Dr. Macintosh, who was recently debarred from citizenship because he placed loyalty to God before loyalty to the state, to recognize how far we have come on the road to the pagan state. The state has virtually ruled that from this time forth citizenship is to be for non-Christians only. The churches of America must change this pagan ruling if America is to be won for Christ.

Again, we cannot preach a God of righteousness and ignore the glaring inequalities and injustices which mark the present economic system. The Communists have engendered in their followers a faith that it is possible to change human nature, a faith that the kingdom of righteousness can and will come on earth here and now. They believe that pecuniary motivation must be radically changed. If the American church is to meet this challenge, it too must have faith in the practicability of the social teachings of Jesus. We must preach with all the power and vigor at our command that men must seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. We must teach that the man who merely seeks economic gain at the expense of his fellowmen is betraying God and crucifying Christ afresh. We must teach that throwing the sanctity of private property around

factories, business institutions, or other forms of special privilege when they are not genuinely serving the interests of the largest possible number of the people, is forfeiting all ethical and moral title to them.

In some way the Communists have succeeded in engendering in the mass of the youth of Russia the power and the desire to serve society. The Communists have been able to create a sense of exhilaration, of mental excitement, and the feeling that their ends are for a moral, even spiritual goal, which transcends all other programs of church or state. To meet their challenge the American church must make its members see the moral adventure of Christianity in terms of translating our social and economic order. The church cannot preach and teach a doctrine on the Lord's Day and acquiesce in direct contradiction to its doctrine in factory, department store, and counting house every other day of the week. We must create the sense of living up to the highest ethical declarations which we preach and pray about on Sunday. Unless the church can do this it inevitably must go down under the frontal attack of Communism.

In conclusion, then, the church can take one of three roads. It can withdraw from the world to the extent of centering its efforts on the beauty of worship, on mysticism, and on personal religion. To some extent the church has taken this path already. While I would be the last to deny the

importance of these three aspects of religion, it is futile to hope to cleanse American society by a religion whose emphasis is exclusively centered on worship, mysticism, or personal piety.

A second road the church can take is to submit or to conform to the state and the economic order. This means taking on the color of the established institutions. It is the comfortable road of large cathedrals, good salaries, and complete impotence.

Finally there is the path which deliberately attempts to transform the entire political and economic order; which makes use of worship and of mysticism, to be sure, but uses them as aids to the bringing in of the kingdom of God. Such a religious faith must aim not alone to revolutionize the hearts of men but to revolutionize the entire social order. It will probably recognize that capitalism is an evil as slavery once was. It will center its attack on the basic evils, not fritter its energies on the side lines.

It is with this purpose in view that there has recently been organized a National Religion and Labor Foundation with two full-time paid secretaries. This organization includes Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in its membership and aims to do in the labor field something of what the National Council for the Prevention of War does in the peace field. It is a tragic commentary on American Christianity that although we maintain a large number of full-time secretaries in the

peace field there is only one full-time secretary in the economic field. There is an impelling need for translating religion into the economic life of the nation. This Religion and Labor Movement founded by Catholics, Jews, and Protestants is a radical and fearless crusade for social righteousness. A monthly bulletin called *Economic Justice* will be sent to thousands of ministers.

May I reiterate again some of the challenges of Communism? We must have a sensitivity to the needs all about us. We must make the needs of the underprivileged supreme. We must be undaunted by the obstacles. No matter how strong the injustice, whether capitalism or war, it cannot permanently endure if it is wrong. We must refuse to compromise on fundamentals. We must guard against the danger of being so tactful or subservient that our strategy will disguise the conflict with the forces of materialism and economic privilege. Rather we must show up the evils of existing capitalism in their stark-naked hideousness. At the present time countless numbers of churches have betrayed Christ by acquiescing in conventional economic practices or by keeping silent in the face of economic wrong. As ministers of Jesus Christ we must recognize again that we are leaders in a revolutionary movement which is seeking nothing short of the complete overthrow of special privilege, economic selfishness, and racial discrimination. This in-

volves not only a revolution of the human heart but a revolution of the social order. As ministers we must be ready to sacrifice, if need be to lose, position for this cause. We must prove that Christianity has a greater dynamic power, a greater capacity to sacrifice, a greater ability to reconstruct the economic order for the benefit of all the people than Communism. It is only thus that we can meet its challenge.

PREACHING AND THE INDUSTRIAL ORDER[1]

HARRY FREDERICK WARD

I SHALL assume that this subject—"Preaching and the Industrial Order"—extends to the economic order—that organization, that way of life, that philosophy of living which surrounds the farmers in our churches as well as the city people. Whatever message the pulpit may have concerning that order will grow, I think, out of the pastoral function of the preacher. We have had so much to say about preaching growing out of the preacher's knowledge of the needs of his people. Well, what kind of preaching is going to grow out of the needs of the unemployed? out of the needs of the farmers and the professional people whose incomes have been cut until they do not know how they are going to educate their children? I cannot conceive that the pastoral function of a church can possibly stop with trying to teach those people how to endure the disaster which has overwhelmed them. If we have no message to bring them concerning the way out, then the church will, before very long, fail to have any part in their lives.

The situation has changed entirely since that in

[1] A corrected stenographic report.

which the Methodist Episcopal Church and others first began to concern themselves with this question. If you look back to 1900, you can run through practically the course of a generation to the beginning of 1930, in which large sections of religion in this country were concerned with trying to humanize the social and industrial order. I know that sometimes it was called trying to Christianize it, but I think when you analyze it, you will find that the work of the churches in that period was more humanistic than anything else. It was concerned with softening the brutalities of the conflict between the classes. It was concerned with trying to ameliorate the social ills.

But to-day another situation demands another emphasis. We are in what we call a "depression." In the country where I have lived for the larger part of the past year even the high-school children give a different name to it. They call it the "economic crisis." They ask you whether it is really as bad in your country as their papers have told them, and they are taught that it is a crisis which comes out of contradictions in the nature of the capitalist system itself.

I think that there is no beginning of wisdom in the endeavor of the pulpit to fulfill its function in the present world crisis until it does know exactly what has happened. To know all of the church history will, I think, be of comparatively little value in the present situation that mankind is in,

unless with it you also know what is the essence of the world history of the last three years; unless you understand that at the end of the year 1929 and at the beginning of the year 1930 a period in human history was closed; that when the crash came in American finance, it registered the fact for all the world that the capitalist system had passed the peak of its economic efficiency. In its day and generation it added great things to the record of the human race, but now its hand has lost its cunning. Its technique is no longer adequate to the situation in which man finds himself, and its human deficit is greater than its practical achievements. You will also remember that about the same time when our so-called prosperity collapsed a new economic order began to register its first effectiveness, and another page was turned in the human record in another part of the world. Unless you understand this fact, that we have been closing one period of human history and opening another, you will not get your approach to the task that is required of the Christian pulpit in this generation.

Perhaps you will ask, "What are the evidences for that statement of judgment?" Well, those of you who have not read *The Decay of Capitalist Civilization*, by the Webbs, had better make yourselves acquainted with it at once. It would also be well to follow the analysis, made in a current book, *A Guide through World Chaos*, by G. D. H.

Cole, of Great Britain, and then you will understand the meaning of one or two major facts that lie behind the hasty judgment I have made. It is a fact that in the United States, where the capitalist system had the greatest chance on the earth to prove its economic efficiency, there is more unemployment in ratio to population than anywhere else in the world. England has had over a million unemployed for the last ten years and nobody has been able to solve the problem of finding work for them. The last desperate move of the Tories, the attempt to build an iron tariff wall around the British Empire, is doomed to failure because of the contradictions within the capitalist system, because the inherent economic strife between separate parts of the British Empire cannot be reconciled even under the necessity of trying to save it.

If you go back of the facts that in a world technically capable of producing plenty we cannot feed the hungry nor send the children properly to school, you will find the manifest signs of decay of the capitalist society that has been built up around this economic order. If you will read *The Decline of the West*, by Spengler, a German, you will see how deadly close the parallel runs with the declining days of the Roman Empire, that all the social phenomena which then marked the end of an epoch are now duplicated in Western society. There is this difference, of course, between the position of the Christian Church to-day and that

little company of Christians who faced the failing Roman Empire. They had the new gospel that came entirely from another source, and had no taint of the corruption with which that ancient order of power and gold and its gods were imbued. But to-day the church that faces this declining order is bound to it. We are, in some of our aspects, bone of its bone and blood of its blood. Therefore for us, if we are to bring a message of life to a world whose hope is fast failing, the question is—How are we to separate ourselves from the body of this death? Can we write another Apocalypse which will bring to judgment this great empire of money that is now tottering and falling as did those last pages in the Bible which so describe the might of ancient Rome that the world can see forever the source of its decay, the center of its corruption? Now are the kingdoms of this world judged by the process of history. But are we taking up the task of our Master and enabling our people to see the judgment so that no long agonizing period of decay may drag us down to darkness and death, so that no long struggle of the dark ages may intervene before this western world finds a way out into light and hope again?

There lies the challenge of this particular moment of human history to the Christian gospel and to those who preach it. Our first function is to bring to judgment this order which is now bringing such misery to the lives of human beings as it

has long brought such corruption to their hearts and souls. Already, the church has in part answered that challenge. The last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church put itself on record, as I think no other religious body in the Western hemisphere has yet done, when it said, "The present industrial order is unchristian, unethical and anti-social, because it largely depends upon the profit motive, which is an appeal to selfishness."

In that word "largely" you can see registered the difficulties of getting any such utterance through a General Conference committee. There is something else there beside the necessary adjustment to different points of view in a committee. That word is in part the result of a desire for accuracy, yet it registers a confusion between the economic order and the individuals who are in it. The other night I listened to a discussion in a theological faculty which turned upon this point, and one man said, "The essential evil in the capitalist system is that it puts money first."

"Oh, no," said another, "the men who were in college with me and who went out into business as I know them don't put money first."

Of course, if there were not some individuals in a group who were more moral than the group itself, we would never have any ethical progress.

But how does that affect our judgment upon the group as a whole? According to the definite state-

ment of economists of the capitalist persuasion, when you take the system as a system, it depends not largely, but entirely upon the profit motive. Take, for example, the verdict of one of the British economists whose purpose it is to save the capitalist system: after he had spent a few weeks in Russia in the early days, he said that the great difference between that country and England was that in Russia money had ceased to be the dominant influence in life. In capitalistic society, he declared, money is the goal of every endeavor and the criterion of every effort. Preaching which does not recognize that fact is not able to bring the economic order to moral judgment nor to help a confused and baffled people to find the way out.

A letter I had the other day from a friend living in Moscow, said in part: "Our job is to remove the imperfections of a new and growing order. Yours is to get rid of an old order and to discover what is to be put in its place."

The beginning of wisdom in that job of replacing a dying system is to know where its essential evil is. Otherwise, the people would be left indeed as sheep scattered abroad without a shepherd, knowing that calamity is before them but not knowing from whence it came or how it can be avoided; not only beaten but baffled. They have never been taught to analyze a system; they have never been taught to think of evil as a social force but only

as a personal factor. They think only in terms of persons, putting the responsibility upon a few individuals, hoping that things will pick up. That is the American attitude and the American habit. For it our preaching must take a part of the responsibility. We have taught and preached almost entirely in personal terms, as though the individual were an abstraction, that atomic unit which the eighteenth century made him. He has never been with us, as he was with Jesus and the apostles, the indissoluble member of a community, a person bound to other persons from whom he could not be separated, whose keeper he was, whom he must offend sometimes unknowingly by his customs and practices, in whose evil he must share both in consequence and in responsibility. Until we can rewrite our Christian doctrine of personality in terms of the social nature of self, in terms of the inevitable requirements of the machine age which makes human life more and more complex and binds it more and more together, we shall not be able to help our beaten, baffled parishioners to bring this failing order to judgment and to find the way out of it. I don't suppose it will mean very much if you just get up and say to your parishioners, "The General Conference has said that the present industrial order is unchristian, unethical and anti-social."

If a statement like this is to be something more than an emotional protest, I think you will have to

correlate the moral judgment with the technical facts; you will have to know the main technical points which demonstrate that the economic machinery of the capitalist system is now out of date and inadequate to a growing world.

There is one point which I think ought by this time to be a household word with every intelligent preacher. Even a Presidential candidate for one of the old parties can now tell us that the basic defect of our present system has been its failure to distribute purchasing power to the masses of the people. But is that simply a technical defect? The machines are idle, the acres are untilled in the face of unsupplied human needs because sufficient purchasing power has not gone to the masses of the people! That is basically a moral defect also. It is a failure to distribute the joint product of men's labors equitably. Against that we have been thundering for almost a generation, but now we have the facts overwhelmingly on our side. God is not to be bought. A moral law cannot be broken with impunity, and all our super-efficiency breaks down helpless and hopeless because it fails to fulfill the basic requirement of the righteousness of the kingdom of God. One of our modern anthropologists declares that the achievement of social justice is the basic requirement for social cohesion. If he is right, we now have on our hands something more than the technical decay of an economic system. We have the breakdown of a

whole civilization because it has failed to work out justice.

Take another technical defect in our economic order: Just recently a report was issued by a group of engineers who for ten years have been trying to analyze the increasing inefficiency of our industrial system. They show that the basic breakdown is due to the discrepancy between the financial system and the technical system; that the financial system has piled up a debt of two hundred eighteen billion dollars upon the productive plant of this country, and because the plant is no longer able to carry that debt it increasingly has to quit producing. We call it capital; they call it debt, in accordance with the verdict of one of England's leading scientists.

Here is the corollary of the failure to provide sufficient purchasing power. It is because this overhead capital debt, much of it fictitious, has been piled up in new forms of property rights that purchasing power has been unable to go to the masses of population. Here you have the fact of property becoming power and privilege instead of a functional means for the carrying out of useful services to mankind. Here, again, you put your finger upon a basic moral failure as well as a technical defect.

Millions of human beings in this country have felt the weight of this crisis holding them back from that abundant life which our gospel and our de-

mocracy have jointly promised them. Soon they are going to look with a different attitude than they now hold toward these intrenched property rights. In the last session of Congress one of the leading economists of this country appeared before the Senate Committee which was charged with bringing out a bill to provide some relief for the hungry people of this country. Having pleaded in vain for the necessary appropriations, he finally said to them, "Gentlemen, if you will not be guided by considerations of human need, if human suffering has no adequate weight with you, then I would suggest that you give ear at least to the consideration of expediency. I am well read in history, as I assume you are, and I know no grounds for assuming that millions of people are going to sit down permanently and go hungry, especially in the presence of plenty."

As that fact develops, you will be faced, as preachers of the righteousness of the kingdom of God, with the necessity of deciding between the validity of these property values that have been piled up here in this period of so-called prosperity and the necessities of these human lives. The whole question of what we call confiscation will become just as burning an issue for you as the question of confiscating the rights of the owners of slaves was for our grandfathers. Your gospel, if it is to have any place in modern society, will have to lead you and the people who sit under your

preaching to take a stand upon that issue, not simply as a legal question, but one which touches the essence of the morality of the kingdom of God.

Then comes the question, What does the analysis of capitalism on moral grounds mean for your theology? At one particular point this question becomes urgent; because a moral analysis of capitalist society brings you face to face with the problem of corporate evil, that is evil in the organized life of humanity. I do not know that liberal Christianity is equipped to face the problem of evil, either in the individual or in the corporate life, where it comes to its climax.

We have been attempting to deal with individual life in the last generation by the educational, evolutionary method. It is one thing to use that method with children who have been born in Christian homes and recognize the validity of the Christian faith almost unconsciously, but it is another thing to use it with men who are set to do evil and to break down all the fabric of righteousness. For such men, we have always had to have another approach in our gospel. I think that we have forgotten in liberal Christianity the revolutionary nature of the process of conversion, the remaking, the re-creation of human nature after it has reached the stage of evil in adult years. It is this situation that you have to face in the economic order and in the whole social system. You have an old system on your hands, and at the

heart of it you have found evil. This situation obviously cannot be remedied by a few mechanical adjustments on the outside. Yet this is the nature of the only attempts that are now being made to correct the defects in American society. This, of course, is due to our mechanistic attitude toward life.

How are you going to remove evil from the heart of our corporate life? Will you do it with a gospel that is any less revolutionary in its social requirements than your gospel has been heretofore in its demand upon the individual life? Is not the corollary of your approach to the problem of individual sin from the standpoint of Christian gospel that you will demand such a rooting out of evil, such a remaking of life, as you have always demanded when you have called the individual to repent and forsake his sins, to renounce the devil and all his works? On what other basis can you expect to make a change in human society adequate to the needs of the analysis that you, as preachers, are beginning to make?

I would point out to you that the challenge of Communism to the Christian religion is not altogether in the method by which it is calling the people of the world to change the social organization, but in the fact that it also presents to them a discipline for eradicating from human nature the love of money. I would ask you whether in your religious education you have provided a discipline

which will eradicate from the children growing up in Christian families that love of money which is demonstrably the root of the evil in the acquisitive society. I would ask you whether you have any chance of such a discipline becoming really effective as a social force.

The conjunction which the Communist way of life offers to the youth of the world is a program which makes it impossible for people to pursue the making of money by the exploitation of their fellow human beings, and is a rigorous personal discipline to eliminate the love of money that has not been duplicated since the days of the monastic orders. I am not suggesting any competition in either theology or discipline between the Christian religion and Communism. I am simply pointing out that there seems to be no adequate approach to this problem of corporate evil that does not combine these two factors. There should be some method that will stop the organization of money-making in society itself, along with a discipline that will change the human attitudes and desires.

But I do not think that we shall move the people of the United States to any sufficient sense of the nature of the evil that is at the heart of modern society, nor get them to see a way to root that evil out, unless we ourselves can come to a new sense of our part in it as ecclesiastical institutions. If what I am saying has any point, it means that the forerunner of any adequate change in the social

system that would save us from the process of decay and bring new life into organized society must be the fact of social repentance. In the nature of the case, the church cannot call the world to social repentance unless it repents itself, and I have seen no sign of that as yet. One of the terrible temptations of preaching is that we tend to look at evil outside ourselves and outside our institutions. "He saved others; himself he cannot save." Aye, and there is another angle to that too. Unless he could save himself by dying for others, he could not save others.

I am perfectly sure that the one thing more than any other that is keeping the whole body of the Christian ministry from seeing clearly the evil that is at the heart of the money-making society is the inhibition set up by institutional ecclesiastical interests. I submit to you that the basis of any effective preaching to convince the world of the essential sinfulness of the present capitalistic society is that the church should separate itself from any form of dependence upon capitalist society that involves the exploitation of human beings. Only then will it have a message that has the power of conversion.

PREACHING AND THE RACE PROBLEM

WILLIAM NELSON DEBERRY

PERHAPS the discussion of my theme, "Preaching and the Race Problem," may be fittingly introduced by asking and answering the question, "Is there a definite relationship between preaching and this particular problem?"

The answer to this question depends, I think, upon what we conceive to be (1) the legitimate function of preaching and (2) the essential nature of the race problem.

The fundamental purpose of gospel preaching is the reformation of sinful individuals and sinful society. In other words, preaching seeks through the public proclamation of religious truth to rescue individuals and human society from all unrighteousness and its evil results. It seeks to establish in a world of unrighteousness and sin a social order in which the ideals of social justice, of human equality and brotherhood as proclaimed by Jesus, are to be the cardinal principles of conduct.

If this be a just and accurate estimate of the function of preaching, let us, in connection with it, proceed to define the race problem. The race problem in America is primarily the problem of securing the harmonious relations of peace and

good will among the varied racial groups that compose our American body politic. Among the many obstacles which beset the solution of this problem are social custom and social tradition based on certain accidental or artificial facts.

Outstanding among these obstacles is the arrogant and unwarranted assumption of one race that it is inherently superior to another. This assumption implies the right of such a race to enslave, to rule, to exploit and to oppress another as its own welfare or pride may decree. The problem of divesting all races of this superiority complex and creating among them a spirit of friendly co-operation for the common welfare of all is the real essence of the race problem.

Into a world which was smitten and torn by the ravages of interracial bitterness and strife came Jesus of Nazareth proclaiming a gospel of neighborly love and human equality. To a small company of devoted followers he committed this gospel and commanded them and their successors to go forth and reproclaim it to all peoples throughout the world. What, then, in the light of these facts, is the relation of modern preaching to the modern race problem? The relationship is so obvious that it scarcely needs to be stated.

The race problem is a world problem and is too comprehensive and intricate for adequate treatment by one of my own limitations of knowledge or by anyone in the brief period allotted for this

paper. It involves the prolonged fight for freedom and justice which the handicapped of many races are making all over the world. Mahatma Gandhi is leading this fight to-day in India. Racial injustice casts its dark shadow over every land and people and holds in the grip of its vile tentacles the fettered fortunes of both the oppressor and the oppressed. It is a stupendous issue which from time immemorial has baffled the wisdom of statesmen and sages.

I refrain from any attempt to interpret or to evaluate the race problem in its larger and wider aspect. I undertake to consider but one phase of this world problem, namely, that which concerns the relations between the Anglo-Saxon and Negro races in America. Having done this, I shall allow you to formulate your own conclusions as regards the duty and responsibility of the Christian preacher and the Christian Church in the premises.

If the race problem in America is the problem of securing through friendly interracial co-operation the ends of peace and good will among the several races that compose our American body politic, what, let me ask, from the Negro's point of view, are the possibilities of such relations between his own and the dominant race with which he is in social conflict? In answer to this question, I shall state clearly and frankly what the Negro regards as the indispensable condition of a lasting peace agreement.

It is related of Frederick Douglass, the noted Negro orator and abolitionist, that once while pleading the cause of his race before a large audience, he was interrupted by one of his auditors who in a captious spirit asked this question—"Just what does the Negro want?" Douglass, who was an adept at sharp and witty retort, responded instantly, "He wants to be let alone." This clever reply was fitting for the occasion and for the times in which Douglass lived. For it was very true that in the days of Douglass there were many Negroes who wanted seriously to be let alone by those who were disposed to oppress and persecute them.

But there were and still are other important relationships in which the Negro cannot afford to be let alone. I wish, therefore, to substitute for this answer of Douglass another which is adequate for all times and occasions and which also designates in bold outline the grand condition of enduring peace between the two races. The Negro wants no more and no less than a square deal as an American citizen. He wants a man's chance in the race of life. In other words, he wants the larger freedom from which he is so generally debarred in this country by the spirit of prejudice and caste.

Let me define briefly this larger freedom for which he longs and strives and without which he will never be contented nor at peace with those who deprive him of it.

First, he wants a larger industrial freedom.

The fixed industrial status of the Negro during slavery was that of the bond servant and menial. This status survived his emancipation and continues during his freedom. Because of the tradition and custom of slavery which thus fixed so firmly the black man's place as a "hewer of wood and drawer of water," he is still excluded from certain wide fields of industry in which he is as fully able to produce and create as thousands of his Anglo-Saxon fellows who are engaged in these fields. The Negro pleads that the aspiring and capable Negro may be free to rise above the restricted, traditional limits of menial service according to his capacity and fitness for the higher walks of life; that the Negro youth who has been endowed with some superior talent and who by patient effort has prepared himself for its exercise in the world's work, may not have the door of opportunity forever closed in his face because God chose to create him black; that the Negro, like every other American, be given an industrial chance according to his moral worth and his industrial fitness.

He also pleads for legal protection in the exercise of this freedom. The crying need of such protection is illustrated by the following sad incident:

Recently several white men were arrested and indicted in Mississippi for complicity in the murder of Negro firemen who were at work on the

railroad systems of that state. These arrests were brought about by the insistence of railway authorities only after eight Negroes had been shot down in cold blood. Of their crime the Jackson (Mississippi) *News*—an influential white daily—said:

"Their only offense was that they were holding jobs that white men evidently wanted. They were peaceful, hard-working, law-abiding Negroes entitled to the full protection of the law in their God-given right to earn their living in the sweat of their faces.

"These Negroes were our wards. They exercised but few of the rights of citizenship. They did not vote, they took no active part in civic affairs, they did not lobby in legislative halls, and they did not make themselves vocal about the prevalent depression. On the contrary, they went humbly and faithfully to their daily tasks offering no protest when their wages were slashed or working hours reduced. And yet, because white men coveted their jobs, they had to die."

Secondly, the American Negro wants a larger social freedom. It is this freedom alone that will prevent the unjust, the undemocratic, and the unchristian group segregation of which the Negro race is the unfortunate victim to-day, and in which the government under which he lives is *particeps criminis*. The recent humiliating experience of the Negro gold-star mothers is a flagrant illustration

of the government's attitude toward race segregation.

The thoughtful, self-respecting Negro is not a social intruder. While he realizes that there is nothing improper in his social intercourse with decent people of whatever race, his self-respect will not allow him to intrude socially upon individuals or private circles. He believes that freedom of choice in all personal social relations is a human right that should be neither infringed nor violated; he believes, further, that the question of social companionship is one to be settled by individual taste and preference rather than by legal enactments and decrees.

The Negro deplores in this connection the American custom of confusing social privileges and civil rights. In some sections of the country, because of the bugbear and scarecrow of "social equality" he is shorn of certain of his civil rights, the enjoyment of which would make him appear to be on a plane of social equality with those who are supposed to be his social superiors. On account of this unwarranted fear he is made to ride in Jim-Crow cars and endure third-class accommodations while at the same time he is compelled to pay first-class fare. He is made to pay taxes for the maintenance and support of public parks, public libraries, and other public institutions from the use of which he is rigidly excluded. In all this he must pay for certain

privileges and be denied the right to enjoy them—an inalienable right of every human being and a civil right of every American citizen. Taxation without representation is as unjust to-day as it was a hundred and fifty years ago when Patrick Henry first uttered this immortal dictum. It always has been and it always will be unjust. The Negro is neither asking nor seeking indiscriminate social equality with any other group, for Negroes have no such thing among themselves. What he wants is the freedom to enjoy the public privileges and benefits which are his by right of his character and his citizenship.

Again, the Negro wants a large political freedom. As a race the Negro finds himself in an unfortunate, anomalous situation as a citizen of this republic. He is, to a very large extent, still deprived of the free use of the ballot in a country of which he is a citizen and under whose flag he has heroically fought and died.

Constituting well-nigh one tenth of the total population and our welfare as a people in constant peril, we do not have and are not allowed to have our just and equitable quota of representation in the law-making bodies of the government. This unfortunate and anomalous situation is made possible by the ruthless shearing of colored citizens to so large an extent of manhood suffrage; and this in flat violation of the 15th Amendment of the federal Constitution, which declares that "the

right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied nor abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The Negro often wonders just what these words of the Constitution really mean. But what do the rank and file of Americans really care about the federal Constitution or its Amendments?

It is contended as a reason for the wholesale disfranchisement of the race in the South that there is a danger of the Negro accomplishing a long-cherished purpose to get again the reins of civil government in his hands; and that if this purpose is ever realized, there will be a repetition of that historic reign of terror which prevailed during the carpetbag era of the reconstruction period.

Both the fallacy and the unreasonableness of this contention are so obvious that it is scarcely necessary to refute or even consider it.

What the Negro asks in view of this distressing condition is not for the chance to hold the reins of government, for the great majority of Negroes have no such vain hope; he asks that the black man who has complied with the legal conditions of voting may have a voice in the government of himself in this government of the people, for the people, and by the people. And what is here meant by the term, "the people"? Does it mean the white people only? I believe not. It means

all the people of our nation, irrespective of race or creed, who are obedient to the laws of the land and loyal to the flag. And has not the Negro, let me ask, been loyal to Old Glory? In every war in which the nation has engaged, he has shouldered arms and been first in the ranks of those who have bared the breast to the shafts of the enemy.

What, again let me ask, was his conduct as a soldier during the recent great world conflict in which our country engaged to make the world safe for democracy? As he went to the front, there were those who asked: "What have you to fight for; you who are disfranchised, Jim-Crowed, maltreated, and burned at the stake? Is not this the psychological moment for the Negro to avenge his wrongs?

These were searching questions. But what was the Negro's answer? He waived his grievances for the time being, went forth to fight for democracy and made a record "over there" of which he has no reason to be ashamed. And since this record was made, the Negro has been asking this vital question, "Will the government keep faith with me?"

But more urgent and more significant still than his plea for either industrial, social, or political freedom, is the black man's plea for the freedom of his mind. The freedom to educate and rise in the scale of mental development and mental achievement is the highest freedom of man. For as

someone has observed, "There is nothing great in the world but man; and nothing great in man but mind."

The most pathetic plight of the Negro masses in the black belt of the Southland to-day is the plight of their minds. But how could it be otherwise when for two hundred years American slavery, the curse of your race and mine, made it a crime to teach a black man his letters? How could it be otherwise when since his emancipation from bondage the public provision for his education has been shamefully inadequate and unjust?

That intrepid band of heroes, composed largely of the flower of New England culture, which followed in the wake of the victorious Union Army were bent on a high and holy mission. They planted here and there in the Southland the school and the college to emancipate the minds of the freedmen from ignorance and mental bondage. Outstanding among this second army of heroes were Ware, Armstrong, Cravath, and Howard. These prophets and pioneers of Negro education laid broad and firm the foundation of the black man's social evolution. They projected a most potent factor in the solution of the Negro problem. The work of these resulted in a record of educational advance by the Negro which has nowhere been equaled in all the annals of education. Within the brief period of sixty-five years, he has reduced his illiteracy by seventy-five per cent. But this

record, as brilliant and marvelous as it may be, is but a drop in the bucket when compared with the crying need which remains to be met. And this sad fact is not the most discouraging aspect of this dark picture.

A more serious, and hence more alarming, fact is that of the unjust discrimination against the Negro by both state and municipal authorities in the distribution of public-school funds. In one Southern state where the Negro population is fifty-two per cent of the total, the annual allotment for Negro education is but twenty per cent of the total. In eleven Southern states in which the combined Negro population is thirty-four per cent, the annual allotment for Negro education is but eleven per cent.

This common practice is consistent with the long-established policy of keeping a subject people in ignorance as a means of keeping them in industrial bondage. It is in deference to the social edict which forbids forever the victim's emergence from a fixed status of social caste; the edict that decrees a "thus far and no farther" to the intellectual aspirations and capacities of two million black American children. Such an edict is not only a crime against the group which first suffers—it is also a crime against the larger society of which it is a part. For in keeping with a law which no human power can contravene, it is impossible for one member of the social body to thus suffer with-

out all the other members suffering ultimately with it.

It has long been a fact of common knowledge that the most effective method of binding fast all the other actual or potential faculties of man is first to bind fast his mind. This barbarous deed of mental circumscription is perhaps the most flagrant manifestation of "man's inhumanity to man." For one man to arbitrarily describe by metes and bounds and thus attempt to fix forever the scope of another's development is to arrogate to himself a divine prerogative; it is to attempt to frustrate the plan of that Divinity which alone has the right, the wisdom, and the power to shape the ends of all human beings.

The removal of the obstacles which prevent this larger freedom of the Negro as a man and as an American citizen is what the Negro stipulates as the only condition of a lasting peace agreement, and is the only real solution of the Negro problem.

What, then, does he expect of the Christian pulpit and the Christian Church in the accomplishment of this tremendous task? I must here be frank to reply that the thinking Negro expects very little. There are two causes that have led him to adopt this attitude of skepticism and doubt. First, it is because of the widespread silence of the pulpit as regards the problem with which he is so vitally concerned. An outspoken champion of the black man's cause in the American pulpit to-day

is like a lonely voice crying in the wilderness. Secondly, it is because of the culpable manner in which outstanding representatives of the church have so often faced and handled this problem. Because of these facts hundreds of our educated Negro youth have but scant faith in the sincerity of the church's preachments and platitudes about human equality and brotherhood.

The church above all other human institutions has been charged with the serious business of breaking down the barriers of interracial strife and ill will and inculcating in the selfish heart of mankind the principles of union and peace. When it deserts this high calling and stoops to foster and abet the hydra-headed monster of race prejudice, how can it retain the confidence and respect of the victims of this monster? If by the practice of our religion here at home we alienate from our faith more of the heathen who come to live among us than our missionaries convert to it by their preaching in heathen lands, should the Negro who has dwelt here much longer than the heathen be condemned for falling from grace in the same fashion?

With the Negro, as with all others who think, conduct is the most convincing preacher. While I appreciate to the utmost the noble record of the church and the heroic part it has played in the past in the social uplift and progress of the Negro, I wish to cite, even at the risk of being misunder-

stood, certain glaring instances of default in this connection which illustrate the trial of the black man's faith.

A few years ago, an evangelist of national prominence was engaged to conduct a series of evangelistic meetings in a Southern city. The local committee in charge of arrangements informed the Negro residents that while they would be permitted to attend the meetings, it would be necessary, in deference to social custom, for them to occupy exclusively a segregated section of the auditorium in which the meetings were to be held. This advice was a humiliating blow to the pride of the Negro populace, as many of them desired to hear the famous preacher. So they held a meeting at which it was decided to write to the evangelist and apprise him of the situation in the hope that he might intervene in their behalf.

He replied that while he regretted deeply to learn of the condition which had developed, he deemed it the part of wisdom not to interfere. He also added that he was coming to the city to preach the gospel and not to solve the race problem. This closed the incident and the Negroes remained away from the meetings.

The following year, a famous agnostic was engaged by a local chapter of free thinkers to lecture in the same city and in the same public auditorium. Again there were many Negroes who desired to hear the message of the renowned infidel. But on

inquiry, they too were informed that in keeping with a time-honored social custom, it would be necessary for them to sit together in a section of the building designated for them. Following the example of the protestants on the occasion of the evangelistic meetings, they communicated with the lecturer, informing him of the facts. In his prompt response to their communication, he thanked them for their letter and assured them that there would be no racial segregation on the occasion of his lecture. In a subsequent letter to the local committee of arrangements, he advised that as he was coming to preach a gospel of intellectual freedom, he must insist that every auditor, of whatever race or religion, be free to sit where he pleased; and that unless this regulation was adhered to strictly, he would positively refuse to speak.

As a result, the barriers of race segregation were completely removed and white and black alike were allowed to choose their own seats in the hall. The agnostic was heard by hundreds of Negroes who came predisposed to listen to him with acceptance and sympathy.

Which of these two, the evangelist or the agnostic, exemplified the true Christian spirit toward the Negroes?

A ridiculous and shameful situation developed recently in a certain Eastern city in a church bearing the suggestive name of "All Souls" and minis-

tering to both white and Negro parishioners. The Negro members had increased to the point where their presence was unwelcome and objectionable to the white members. To remedy the embarrassing situation, the vestry of the church decided to separate the races. Cards were, therefore, issued to the Negro members announcing that, in the future, they would be permitted to worship in the church on certain Sundays and at certain services only. The vestry also adopted a resolution requesting the rector to resign because he had opposed its action in sending these cards to the Negro members. It is difficult to reconcile this act of this vestry with the connotation of the name of the church—"All Souls"—except upon the assumption that they no longer regarded it as a church for all souls; or perhaps they did not believe that the Negro members had souls.

I have cited these instances not because I believe them to be typical of the attitude of the church as a whole, but because they illustrate an unjust and unchristian sentiment which dominates so large a portion of the church and which is alienating so many Negroes from our Christian faith. It is this sentiment also which is converting the mind and heart of the Negro into fertile soil for Communism and other political and social heresies which are to-day bidding for his allegiance.

One of the most vital questions awaiting settlement by the American people to-day is whether

the American ideal of democracy is capable of indiscriminate application to all the elements of the mixed multitude of our American citizenship; and one of the most vital questions awaiting settlement by the Christian world to-day is whether the Christian principle of brotherhood can survive the acid test of indiscriminate application to all races of mankind.

Upon the settlement of these two vital questions hinges the future of democracy in America and likewise the future of Christianity in the world.

What the Negro wants is not a Negro's chance, but a man's chance in the broad arena of human endeavor and achievement. But if, as some would have it, he is less than man, if God has created him a sort of *tertium quid* with a status somewhere between monkey and man, then he has no moral right to the chance for which he pleads.

A prominent religious leader has advised the black man to cease from aping the white man's civilization and to make a civilization of his own. This advice would have been void of offense to thinking Negroes but for this leader's meaning when he used the term "white man's civilization." For by it he designated the world's highest and best civilization as a monopoly of the white man. Civilization in this larger sense is not the exclusive creation of a single race. It is the combined product of the labors of many peoples in many ages, and it is grossly unjust for those who are first

favored with its benefits to withhold it from their more belated brethren.

I know of nothing which more aptly portrays the present social plight of the Negro as well as his ultimate deliverance from it than does Plato's parable of the mental evolution of mankind. In this parable, recorded in the *Republic*, primitive man is represented by a group of unfortunate human beings who are bound in an underground cave. Behind them and at a distance within the cave, there burns a fire by the light of which dim shadows are cast on the wall before them. As they are bound hand and foot and unable to turn to the right or left, they sit there day in and day out with no other interest than looking on these shadows. At length, by chance, there comes into the cave one who, seeing the miserable lot of the bound captives, has pity on them and desires to see them free. He approaches one of them, breaks his shackles and chains and compels him to stand erect as a man. He then causes him to turn around and face the light. The first effect of the light is to dazzle and pain his eyes which hitherto had beheld shadows only. But they gradually overcome these ill effects until finally he is able to draw near to the fire and look directly upon it. His eyes having thus become adjusted to the fire light, he is led on beyond it and up and out of the cave into the sunlight above ground. Here, again, his eyes are pained and dazzled by the

brighter light of the sun. But gradually and steadily they overcome this handicap until he is able to look up to the heavens and behold the sun itself. Having thus become adjusted to the sunlight and the more desirable environment above ground, he enjoys it and desires no more to dwell in the cave.

But as he walks abroad and views the rivers and mountains; the flowers and trees; as he listens to the songs of the birds and enjoys the many wonders and beauties of nature, he recalls the sad lot of his brethren—bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh—who are still in the cave, looking on shadows. It is here that the question of his responsibility to them confronts him. "Shall I desert them?" he asks, "or shall I go back and do for them what has been done for me?" In loyal response to the unmistakable call of duty, he goes back to the cave to repeat the drama of his own deliverance. One by one, he removes their shackles and chains and leads them first to the fire and then out into the glorious light of day until the last bound captive is free and above ground.

The moral of Plato's parable is twofold. First, it teaches that the eyes of men were made to function in the light and behold the beauties of nature. Secondly, it teaches that they who have been rescued from the dark and led into the light have a duty to those who are still in the dark.

The proud Nordic who to-day holds the high

place of influence and power in the scale of racial ascendancy was himself once a prisoner in this cave.

Julius Cæsar, the great Roman conqueror, declared that when in 55 B. C. he invaded Britain, he found the natives drinking human blood from human skulls; and that they were too ignorant to be slaves. These heathen natives were the ancestral rock from which your Nordic aristocracy was hewn. But you have been rescued from that slough of mental and moral despond and to-day you walk above ground in the freedom and light of a glorious civilization. But your black brother still languishes in the underground cave. From that dungeon of death and despair he sends up to you this Macedonian wail: "Please do for us what has been done for you."

The heavenly vision of Simon Peter as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles made clear the duty of the Jews to share the gospel with the Gentile world. It taught him that no one race was to have a monopoly of the good news of human redemption from sin.

But this vision had a wider significance still than that which is distinctively religious. It implied, as well, the duty of the man higher up to lift the man lower down in whatever sphere of social gradation. It implied the unity of the human family and the inalienable right of every member to the boundless gifts of the one God and

Father of them all. This is the very quintessence of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

When this saving gospel is heard and heeded by the world, the Messianic day of universal peace and goodwill will dawn.

THE PREACHER AND REVOLUTION

G. Bromley Oxnam

The seismograph is an instrument that records the slightest shock or tremor in the earth's crust. Seismological institutes have been established in many universities. As a result, earthquakes are studied, fault-lines are charted, and man builds his earthquake resisting structures. A brilliant professor of geology, who is a member of the faculty of the California Institute of Technology, has been studying the fault-lines of the Pacific Coast. In addition to surface work he has photographed these lines from the air and has thereby been able to trace the path along which the eventual rip will run. Western cities have studied the findings of the seismologists, have revised their building codes, redesigned their fire zones, and have gone so far in some cases as to construct fire-resisting buildings around sections of wooden structures. This is done on the theory that, in the event the water supply is shut off and fire starts, the flames will reach these fire-resisting sections and thus burn themselves out. Underlying these efforts is a recognition of the fact that man cannot remove physical fault-lines.

Sociologists know that social fault-lines cut

across the surface of society. Along such lines terrific shocks have traveled. Social earthquakes have resulted, and some lands are in ruins. In our own country some social seismologists declare that they have felt the tremors that presage catastrophe. Fortunately for society, social fault-lines can be removed. It is this task that confronts us. Will the preacher assume his full part in this endeavor and with others remove the fault-lines, or is earthquake inevitable in the United States?

The word "revolution" is a stimulus that evokes the emotional response we call fear. We cannot disassociate our minds from the terror, the destruction, the cruelty, and the killings associated with this term. Not even a calm consideration of the ideals the revolutionists have sought to enthrone can do this. We remember the challenging slogan "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," but we cannot forget the flash of light upon the guillotine's descending blade. We are stirred by the demand for "the abolition of the exploitation of man by man," but we recall the sufferings of a century, the weary marches across Siberian snows, the long, dark years in the damp cells of the Peter and Paul fortress, the ravages of revolution, the destruction of the civil war, and the cruel repression of the Checka.

Markham looks upon the man with the hoe and thinks of the "whirlwinds of rebellion." Do we

face a whirlwind hour? Have the seismic shocks robbed the conservative of his calm? What is the meaning of the bonus marchers? How may we explain the rebellious farmers of Iowa? Iowa, the center of conservative individualism! Farmers, who inexcusably forgot the proprieties and ridiculed the chief executive of the nation! Whose leader cried, "It is remedy or revolution!" Have the needy been sold for a pair of shoes? Will Jehovah withhold his punishment? How does all this affect the preacher? What are his dangers and duties?

It must be seen at the very beginning that discussion of revolution has passed beyond the academic stage. The game of theoretical tiddledywinks is over. We are no longer interested in flipping economic abstractions into the logical pot. The issue is not change versus status quo. It is—Will change occur peacefully; will it be made intelligently; can we conserve the present values and carry them into the to-morrow that change will create? Or will it be the change of violence with the destruction of unappreciated values by revolutionaries who, denied the values of to-day, do not know their worth? Will there be a blind upthrust of the ignorant who have put their faith in the easily phrased but economically unsound panaceas? These are questions that will be faced and answered by this generation. The preacher belongs to this generation, and he too will be required to give his answer.

The fault-lines that must be removed are many. But a few can be pointed out here. The increasing concentration of wealth in the hands of a decreasing number, with the resultant power and consequent control of the lives of the masses that wealth gives, is such a fault-line. One-eleventh of 1% of the people paid 83% of the income taxes in 1930. It has been estimated that there are 72,000,000 persons in the United States who have reached twenty-one years of age. Since there were but 3,376,552 income tax returns filed in 1930 and but 1,946,675 individuals earned enough to be required to pay a tax, it would appear that less than three persons out of each one hundred, who are liable to pay a tax, actually earned enough to do so. Another possible fault-line may be noted when the case of the returned soldier is considered. Is he to be mobilized by fascist thinkers as in Italy? Will he swing to the left as in other lands? Will he be used by clever politicians who promise him monetary returns so that the politicians may in turn secure advantages which are profitable to them? Why is it that ex-Governor Alfred E. Smith declares "It is time to call a halt"? Why must the President refer to recent activities of the American Legion, in its demand for the bonus, as contrary to the public good and point out that to pay $2,300,000,000 to a favored group of less than 5% of the population is fundamentally wrong? No one, of

course, disagrees with the fullest possible care of any man who was disabled in the conflict. That is taken for granted. However, the facts that General F. T. Hines presented to the Legion convention before it went on record as favoring the bonus by a vote of 1,167 to 109 need to be presented to our people. In Great Britain there were 3,000,000 casualties; to-day there are 500,000 beneficiaries who receive $175,000,000 annually from the government. France suffered 5,623,000, and is paying a total of 700,000 beneficiaries a total of $287,000,000 annually. In the United States, on the other hand, there were but 322,497 casualties. In 1931, 737,850 received from the government a total of $860,000,000. The annual expense for veterans' relief in this country is $2,668 for each soldier dead or wounded. In Great Britain it is $58, in France $51. How has this come about? Who is controlling the organized soldier? Which way will he go? A third situation that may be likened to a fault lies in the possibility of a changed psychology within the American labor movement. There are at the present time 2,901,000 members of the American Federation of Labor. It is a group that has been led by conservative men, who accept the capitalist system as fundamental, who seek through contracts to regulate those relationships in which capital and labor are mutually interested. However, with unemployment increasing, running as

it does from 1,600,000 in good years to 11,200,000 at the present, if the figures of the president of the American Federation of Labor are correct, how long will this group remain conservative in its thinking? Will it turn to the left? Will it turn to fascism? Another danger lies in the changing attitude of the American farmer. Heretofore our farmers, the heirs of the American pioneer, have been individualistically minded and owners of private property. Due to the increase in land tenantry, the tax situation, and underlying it, of course, the disorganization of the entire economic order, the farmer is losing his individualistic psychology and is becoming rebellious. Some farmers are beginning to believe that their interests and those of the industrial worker are similar. Seismographs that record tremors in agricultural regions have been exceedingly active in Russia, India, China, Japan, and more recently in the United States. Additional fault-lines will be found when the preacher studies the so-called white-collar, the educated and the engineering groups. He may well ask, Will the engineers who find many of their great projects frustrated by our profit-seeking organizations continue to serve as employees of these organizations, or will they in turn swing to more progressive or perhaps even radical programs? The preacher may note too the growing dissatisfaction with what appears to be the functional incapacity of the present

economic machine. Production, distribution, and consumption do not function in such fashion as to insure social well-being. It should be seen, likewise, that serious shocks are to occur unless political leadership will follow economic intelligence and recognize that the world is an economic unit, and that no solution can be found that does not envision the economic problem in world terms. When the stock exchange of 1929 carried securities that were valued at $90,000,000,000 and following the crash listed the same securities at $30,000,000,000, it is little wonder that the economist asked the purblind nationalist, "Has the question of reparations, war debts, and economic situations in other countries anything to do with this decline?" It will be seen, therefore, that the danger of social earthquake is real and is not a vague fancy of the alarmist unacquainted with reality. What is the duty of the preacher when faced with the possibility of revolution?

The preacher faces a threefold responsibility. *In the first place, contradicting men who decry "perfectionist ethics" and who talk of the futility of the distant ideal, the preacher must keep the vision splendid before his people and preach the idealism of Jesus in terms of its own perfection.* The reason for this insistence lies in what appears to be a fundamental fallacy in communistic thinking. Karl Marx was profoundly influenced by Hegel's philosophy of history. Hegel uses the terms

"thesis, antithesis, and synthesis" to suggest his idea of historic progress. In a word, an institution is established or an idea is proclaimed. These may be thought of as a thesis. Before long an opposition institution or a contradictory idea emerges, which becomes the antithesis. Out of the conflict comes, we trust, a better institution or a truer idea, which may embody truth from both thesis and antithesis. This is the synthesis, which, in turn, becomes a new thesis. And so the historic process goes on. Marx, believing that the economic factor was the controlling agency in the evolution of society, sketched this evolution in such fashion that the student sees the group rising from slavery to feudalism, from feudalism to capitalism, and, if Marx be correct, from capitalism to Communism. Naïvely the Communist assumes that when capitalism is overthrown and Communism established, this mighty historic process will come to an end. He looks upon Communism as the final stage in the evolution of society. This does not appeal to the student of history, who recalls that man, shouldering his way up from slavery into serfdom, dreamed at last of possessing the status of citizen and believed that when citizenship should be attained, he, as a free man, would be in a position to solve all of his problems and that the millennium would be at hand. Political freedom was achieved, but man learned that still another struggle was ahead—

that of attaining economic freedom. Is it not ridiculous to assume that when economic freedom is attained there is to be no further development? Is it too much to believe that a higher individualism may follow Communism, if it be Communism that is to come? In order to establish the building of the Communist society when the capitalist order collapses, the Communist has sought to master a technique of revolution and create a means whereby the Communist order may be constructed. While the ideal of Communism is in the mind of the thinker, too often the masses put their faith in the means. When the means have been used and whatever is to come has been established, it would appear, as we have seen, that the last stage will not have been reached, that the stage achieved will not measure up completely to the dream, and the people, not finding in the new day that which they had anticipated, will lose faith in the means, and, since the means was the integrating force, will tend to disintegrate. In the American labor movement the unifying force has been, unfortunately, an enemy, not an ideal. Men have united to fight "the exploiter," "Judge Gary," "the injunction," and similar enemies. When the strike is won and the enemy is beaten, the unifying force is gone. This is seen in the political field. Yesterday we struggled for the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. We thought that political freedom would be achieved

if these weapons were given the people. We have the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, and we have found them used by powerful newspapers, the power trust, and anti-social bodies. Many people, placing their faith in these mechanical means, gave up the struggle. They lacked the compelling power of the absolute ideal. There is grave danger that the preacher, dreaming of a kingdom of God, believing that socialistic suggestions hold within them the possibility of realizing much of the Christian ideal, will turn his full attention to mechanics and create a new to-morrow, only to find to-morrow itself not up to his dreams. Disillusionment may follow. It is because of this fact and the necessity of maintaining a unifying force that I have stressed the need of holding before the people this vision splendid and of preaching ethical idealism. In days of social tension it is absolutely necessary that some group keep before the people a perfect ideal which may both unify and beckon them on to stages that are even yet beyond the ken of man.

The second aspect of the preacher's task may appear to be a contradiction of the first. In reality it is not. In addition to the maintenance of the ideal, the preacher must find, or inspire others to find, those techniques whereby the ideal may be translated into the common practice of man. We denounce the profit-making economy and call for the establishment of a personality-making econ-

omy. The practical man interrupts us and asks: "How do you propose to make this shift? Upon what means do you rely?" A careful perusal of the pronouncement of Christian bodies from the Jerusalem Conference to the recent utterances of great denominations reveals major emphasis upon the ideal, the end, the goal, and a tendency to rest in such phrases as "the kingdom of God," "property for use rather than property for power," and "the substitution of the motive of service for the acquisitive instinct." There is all too little facing of the engineering task, too little consideration of the mechanics demanded. Men talk about "controlling the controllable" and of "economic planning" and vote unanimously for the use of science on the one hand and of religion on the other, for the purpose of insuring social well-being, but the unanimity vanishes the moment that a practical proposal is presented which is offered as a means of achieving the end. We are witnessing the transformation of many a constructive progressive into a clever cynic. A clever brain can ridicule Glenn Frank's book by stating there is within it more thunder than dawn, but writing such a statement does not dispel the darkness. Many a radical turns to the comfortable study chair and joins the ranks of the "tired radicals." Men who proclaimed constructive ideals yesterday play the part of the carping critic to-day when practical problems are under discussion. Con-

ferences on such problems might, in the interests of economy, be canceled and victrola records substituted, since the same speakers deliver the same speeches and get the same results. The sameness becomes sinful since mere reiteration of ideals while remaining silent in regard to means is a waste of time, and waste in days of depression is sinful. We insist that economic practices be judged by ethical criteria. We possess the criteria. We judge the practices. We condemn activities that violate the ethical ideal. Immediately those who are responsible for unethical practices respond in one of two ways. Either they attack those who pronounce judgment, seek to destroy them and their kind, dig themselves in to hold present positions, and dream of the army, not alone as an agency for national defense, but as now declared as an agency for economic defense; or they turn to the judges, admit the accuracy of the judgment, repent of their unrighteousness, and ask, "How can our practices be changed so as to square with the ethical criteria?" It is at this point that general terms prove valueless and specific propositions become imperative. It is not enough to talk of our responsibility to the aged. A definite practical and economically sound scheme of old-age insurance must be drafted and made operative. Picturing aged women scrubbing the marble floors of a safe deposit vault and evoking the sympathy of the hearers is not enough. The

wills of the men of executive genius and actuarial training must be touched in such fashion that a practical answer be found and these women, not as a matter of charity, but as a matter of justice, live their declining years in reasonable comfort and in satisfying security.

The final aspect of the preacher's threefold duty is seen in the necessity that he reveal in his person the co-operative spirit that must characterize a co-operative society, that he himself demonstrate the sacrifice that is to be demanded of many before emancipation is achieved, and that he incarnate the love of his fellow men, which must, in terms of good will, rule the individual in his relationship with his fellows in the society of to-morrow. Unfortunately, most of us prefer to risk the deluge later and enjoy the privileges now than to co-operate with emancipating programs which may entail the loss of some of our comforts and privileges, reduce a bit of our prestige based upon possessions, but which may make the communal life richer and the lives of larger numbers freer. How often the political leader in working out his future calculations states, "We can count upon him to favor this proposition since his economic interests are involved"! Why is it that a man can own a fire-trap apartment, make high returns upon the amount of money invested in the building, and associate in good society? Is it because many of us are perfectly willing to own securities which

bring us fair return without troubling ourselves to ask what is the nature of the business we own and what are its practices in the field of human relationships? We look upon the autocratic kings who fought democracy to the last ditch and we find it difficult to understand them. We think of the ancient landlord who kept wide tracts of land for hunting purposes and denied half-starved peasants the right to till the soil as an anti-social being. It is a little bit harder for us to examine our own income and ask, "Is it based upon service rendered and need, or does it come unearned, beyond our needs, and thus give us power over others that our own abilities would never warrant?" It should be seen that the mere statement, "Love one another," means nothing until love is expressed in conduct. Mercy is an ideal, but before it becomes a reality man must find the good Samaritan. Righteousness demands the fearless Amos and justice calls for the transformed Zacchæus. We know God is Father, men are brothers, and life is of infinite worth. But, we must find the way, the truth, and the life—in a word, the means whereby society may become in practice the family of God and abundant life become the lot of all men.

Personally, I am one who yet believes in democracy. I cannot think that the people who conquered a continent, who developed into a world-power within a century and a half, who built and support a school system which more than thirty

million students attend, who possess organizing genius of the first rank, and who, contrary to European criticism, are at heart idealists, will refuse to remove these social fault-lines and thus avoid the earthquake. Surely, the American spirit that manifested itself in the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, the creation of the Constitution, the conquests of the covered wagon, the struggle for the abolition of slavery, and the demands for democracy during the war period will not fail us now. Is it too much to hope that our scientists will use their genius to realize the ideals of religion and thus bring to us America the beautiful?

THE PROPHETIC MINISTRY

FRANCIS JOHN MCCONNELL

SOME ten years or more ago I spoke at a meeting in China. After I had been home for about nine months, I got a letter from one of my listeners which read something like this:

MY DEAR SIR:

I heard you speak last January in Nanking on a certain theme, and may I say to you that as I listened to you I couldn't imagine why anybody would travel all the distance from the United States to China to say that, for it seemed to me that what you said was just what would occur to anybody who thought about matters at all.

But after thinking about your speech for eight months, I have concluded that there was more in it than I thought at the time.

Well, it is something to be able to deliver a speech that anybody can remember for eight months, to say nothing about thinking about it for eight months, and I was rather pleased to read what he said in that letter.

What I write about seems to me to be very important, but I have very great doubts as to whether my readers will feel that way about it, because it is so very, very simple. I think that I will start with some of the experiences I had in India.

When I was out in India a year or two ago, I was delivering a series of lectures, speaking mostly to non-Christian groups. Of course, there were some there who were Christians, some missionaries, but as a rule, I was speaking to non-Christian groups. I had the honor, and I considered it a distinct honor, of meeting a good many distinguished leaders of Hinduism. Time and again the Hindus said to me, "We can understand well enough why you should think of religion as the service of God, or the vision of God, or anything else you want to call it that brings God in, and we can understand well enough why you should be interested in humanitarian service, but may we say to you frankly that we can't see why you put the two together." I heard that all over India. The general text of my addresses, if I may so designate it, was that one in Matthew 22. 37 and Mark 12. 30: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. . . . And with all thy strength: this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

I had taken those commandments as commonplace, so much so that I didn't see how anybody could think of them otherwise. Yet there is in the United States a very remarkable tendency for those two commandments, which Jesus bound together, to fall apart. To my mind, these two

commandments have a kind of organic relationship, but the Hindus do not even think that they belong together.

After an address in which I had talked about the love of God and the service of men being organically bound together, a man whom I regard as one of the greatest leaders of our times, a professor at Harvard, said to me: "I don't see anything in it at all. You think of religion as mysticism, a vision of God, and I believe, of course, as much as you do, in humanitarian service. But I don't see why they are put together."

I have heard that same statement many, many times. The most distinguished publicist in this country said in a comparatively recent article that the emphasis of the church at the present time on humanitarian services was a surrender. Another prominent man said to me a while ago, "The thing that you and I have in our hearts as the vision of God, the love of God and the service of man, is not being taken everywhere as completely self-evident as we think."

It is the function of the prophetic ministry to keep these ideas in mind. I know that they seem dreadfully commonplace. And if you thoroughly know these things, I have nothing more to say; that is if you really know them. However, a great many people say they know things religiously, and that is all we ever hear of it.

There is in this country at the present time a

tendency in the direction of mysticism. We assume that a man who has a mystic experience necessarily has a Christian experience, but he may not at all, even though mysticism is common to religions the world over. There is more mysticism to the square foot or square mile in India than in any other country you can name. However, mysticism in India does not provide in itself a very great place for the service of mankind as mankind. You know, Christianity advances by baptizing the various forms of life and experience in its own name, the name of Christ. It takes over things from heathenism and converts them in institutions as well as individuals. And don't be shocked when I tell you that mysticism was originally heathen, and that it is one of the things that has been baptized in the Christian faith. The remarkable thing about the Old and New Testaments is that all the mysticism is joined to the recognition of human values together with a recognition of divine values, and, moreover, always comes out of a moral purpose and leads on to a moral outcome.

Prophecy began with a certain type of mysticism. For example, back in the days when the term "prophet" was first used, it meant men who went around working themselves up into ecstasies. The great prophets, however, when they had mystic experiences, got something out of the vision that deepened their moral purpose.

If a man is going to have a vision, Christianity insists that he see something worth seeing and that he be able to tell about it.

A man in India whose faith was that of Mohammed, wanted me to attend a meeting of the Mohammed mystics. I went to that meeting. We met in a hut of some kind or another. It was blazing hot and there was a bubonic plague all around us. Maybe that burned out my enthusiasm for the meeting. However, the leader worked himself up by all sorts of physical contortions and twistings. After a little of this, I began getting hotter and hotter, and finally I said to my friend, "Now I know how this is coming out, so I will run along. I have another engagement." I saw what was coming. It was simply a heathen performance, and one can find that everywhere. Even in Christian circles, in these days, there is a tendency to cover over a lot of unwillingness to face an actual situation and get a clear moral view on it.

I have heard it said that the people are craving something mystic. It is all right, if they are craving the right kind of mysticism. I have said this before, and I have been duly corrected and set right time and time again in churches, in the press, and so on. I have said it so long now that I have truly gotten used to it. I will say it again. At the present time there is a failure to meet this whole tremendously urgent situation in the world

in the name of piety itself, and when people say piety they mean a mystic experience that is just an inevitable something or other that sometimes exhausts the life quite as much as it uplifts it, and which leads nowhere; really a religion in retreat. You cannot imagine, merely from the standpoint of your own friends, how serious this matter is. Apart from Harry Ward and perhaps two or three others who have been given that task specifically, I suppose I have had as much experience as any of our ministers in meeting groups of socially discontented people. These groups included college students, as well as others. Perhaps you think that you know exactly what I am talking about when I say to you that the tendency is in that direction.

It is the business of the church to cultivate things in this mystic way, if they come out of moral doing and lead to a moral result. You take the experiences of our Lord. Every one of them had to do with the facing of a task and working through the task; had to do with the uplifting of mankind. Remember those things. We can't very well do one without the other if we are going to have humanitarian service and have it genuine and Christian. That is the test of any Christian mysticism.

The two things belong together and it is the function of the prophet to take the spirit of mysticism and bring into it the vision of human needs and human values for what they are in

themselves. Of course, if we don't have some kind of inner strength, we will run around into all sorts of things—like committees. Committees as such are in such superfluity as to be conceived in sin and born in iniquity.

Wesleyanism has done about as well as any in handling the mystic experience in an organized group. It was a mystic experience in the beginning with John Wesley, who was very level-headed and never let his visions run away with him. He gave his mystic experiences in his preaching. He gave the great vision of the things to come. I think you will agree with me that every time you read one of John Wesley's recommendations to his ministers you find that there is a practical purpose back of it. For one thing, he says to get up as often as you can at five o'clock in the morning. A lot of people made fun of that remark. They could not see why he asked them to get up at five o'clock in the morning. However, it all depends upon what you get up for. If you should get up at that hour to read some of the best books, that is a pretty good reason. Of course, the people went to bed earlier in Wesley's times. But a second reason is this. Get up in the morning because these visions and these mystic experiences rather cool down at five in the morning, and if you have had a glorious and enthusiastic mystic experience the night before, the cold, gray light of the morning will help to

bring the whole thing back into the air of practical good sense.

We do need some kind of vision at the present time, and it must be a vision for the needs of the world.

Then we must have an ideal. The ideal must come out of vision, or out of an intense realization of mankind. It saves you from a good many things. It keeps you from panic and frenzy. It is an air of immortality, a trial of eternal life and of something of that realization of it. It comes upon reflecting about what the personal equation is. It really helps. If you don't do that, it is apt to run into the mechanics of the thing and you won't know just where you are.

There is an eternal value that must be preserved. We get caught in the claims of daily life, doing things long and intensively. The note of enthusiasm may die down. We may not be quite as energetic, but we work all the time and work with a confidence that nothing is likely to shake our belief.

We know that a minister can't go into all the details of everything. But he is supposed to hold fast to some essentials, and he can tell easily enough when a human right is violated. There were great grievances in the steel mills at Pittsburgh at the time of the famous strike a few years ago. During that strike one of the greatest of the steel leaders asked, "What do the ministers

know about the business of the steel industry?" He propounded this question, "How many ministers know what a 'bloom' is?" And the wise newspapers of the country made a very decisive question out of it all. The ministers up and down the valley were told to mind their own business. Well, any minister knows when he is burying a man. He knows that the man is dead. He doesn't make an examination, but that is the general assumption he goes on. And the ministers said, "There are too many deaths around the steel mill." A minister knows too when a coil or a bolt or a rod of hot steel has been driven through a man's leg. He comes to render a pastoral service. When the ministers get together on Monday and tell about the number of deaths in the week, they know that, and that happens to be their business. They know the human side of affairs. They are not supposed to know about the "blooms."

As I see it, the lines can be drawn there. A minister doesn't need to know all the details of any industry. That is left to the technician and the expert. It is their business to know all about industry.

A line that becomes prophetic, runs through all this, and on the broad, prophetic emphasis, it runs through the Old and New Testaments; it is distinctly in a human sense made in the image of God.

I don't want to write about politics and I am not going to particularly, but sometimes the issue isn't clear. It is like the issues of both parties. There isn't much difference, I mean in the practical outcome; there is really not any particular difference. Which reminds me of a story I heard in London sometime ago—the story of a Negro woman and two children. The children were twins. She said to a friend one day: "These two twins of mine certainly look just alike, Mose and Pete. They certainly does resemble one another; especially Pete."

I don't know which of these two parties Pete is, but it certainly resembles the other. You can't get a clear judgment without bringing in the other factors. In almost all of the great issues, there seems to be something fundamental that we can't get hold of, and that seems to be a certain something within religions. In the full sense of the word it is a part of that double commandment, that regard for the neighbor, which, although it seems to be commonplace, should be held fast by all of us.

The trouble is that we as ministers do not say it. But, if we are going to take seriously the idea of mankind for which Christianity stands, we must say it. The prophetic type of mind is another phase of this matter. It separates the prophet from all other men; saying the truth for the truth's own sake, and not always considering

what the effect is going to be. I think that any minister's utterance is apt to be dampened down by the constant asking, "What is the effect of this statement going to be?" Yes, that will dampen a minister's spirit about as quickly as anything I know. But the prophets didn't bother about that at all; though I don't mean that everyone ought to be a prophet. Of course there are sensitive people who are always getting their feelings hurt, and then don't know what to do with their feelings when they are hurt. Somebody said that all God's people were prophets. But not much. We don't want everything blown up all at once. There are really only two or three in a generation. But sometime or another the prophetic note must sound.

In the case of every minister, I think that the pastoral service, if we don't overdo it, is about as fine a service as can be rendered to the people who understand all about it. That doesn't mean that we should go around drawing hard-and-fast distinctions between people, but it does mean that we should know how to make each case an individual case.

Of course it isn't fair to allow yourself to be misunderstood. Sometimes when a question is sprung at you, you can't just say "Yes" or "No," if you are going to be absolutely honest with yourself. You will have to present more than one phase of the question in order to answer it and

be understood. For instance, if some man says to you, "Do you believe in the virgin birth, yes or no?"—you would naturally want a chance to explain what you thought about it, even though eventually your answer would be "Yes" or "No," because if you say "Yes," it may mean to that man that you take over the whole load that goes with it; and if you say "No," you may put yourself in the light of denying everything that that man thinks worth while.

But getting back to our point of the effect upon something or other by that which is said, well, the prophets just didn't do it. We have had quite a bit of that in this country in the last five years. We have heard men say, "Oh, no, anybody could see that unemployment was coming." Even leaders in official positions said: "No, no. Well, even if we do think so, we mustn't say it anyhow." And we get to the place where people think that we just don't know anything about it.

Yes, we have heard it said that prosperity was right around the corner. Well, I'd like to know what in the world it is putting in its time doing. And then this talk about prayer for the return of the good old times. What we want is the good times, but not the good old times, as they weren't very good after all.

It is a compliment to a man to be able to speak right out and know that he will be understood, and this is especially so when something dis-

agreeable is said. I may say something like this, "We may not be out of the depression for ten years." And it may be so. Who knows? England has been in for eleven years. There may be just as much reason for saying that as the other thing—that prosperity is right around the corner.

My point is that sometimes things that are very unpleasant have to be stated, and they have to be stated regardless. The truth can be an end or an instrument. Sometimes people come dangerously near lying, and we want to watch out for that. A minister whom I once knew said that it was a part of his duty to alleviate the harshness of the truth. It was his business, he thought, to make adjustments in this world. Other men have denied lying as such, but they have said that they had skill in presenting different aspects of the truth to different persons. Church committees have that power down to a fine point.

As I said before, the prophets never bothered with this phase of the matter. They simply proclaimed the truth.

I am afraid, in spite of all our good times in the past, that we aren't facing things quite as squarely as we might; not from the standpoint of pure prosperity, but from the standpoint of things that make eternal life everlastingly worth while.

There is a remarkable story of Wesley in which he brought out this point. Wesley had been misunderstood, as we all know, and he said this in

connection with money: "Make all the money you can. Save all the money you can. Give all the money you can." You can imagine that his statement was taken just about as we take it to-day, with a decrease of emphasis on the third point. What Wesley really meant was: "Get all the money you can. Save all the money you can. And give it all practically away."

Necessarily, we have to run risks, and we have to run the risk of misunderstandings in a lot of things. We are not doing much witnessing except on paper. I don't say this bitterly. Our last General Conference made some of the noblest statements, and they are going to do good. They are to be quoted all around the English-speaking world. There is no doubt about that. But I am not so sure as to how seriously we really take them, in our clamoring for the reconstruction that we think should take place, and the overturn of the present social order. When some of us get away from the Conferences, that is about all there is to it. We can make all sorts of excuses, and for the most part they are good excuses. Still, I am always glad for the statements made at our Conferences.

I go around in New York quite a good deal and talk to people at various places, and every time I announce a meeting at the New School of Social Service the Communists scatter themselves in the audience. There is an ordinance in the city that

no lights can be turned out in any hall as long as there is any still present in the hall. So the minute the meeting is closed, the Communists all rush down to the platform, and then they hold their meeting—free. Sometimes they rush down before the speaker is through, as they have done when I was speaking. This is really a very serious matter. In some places where I have spoken on social questions, how many Methodists have I ordinarily found? Ordinarily three, myself, my wife and my daughter, and once in a while my secretary, and in that case the number will be four. And then I get letters the next day from certain people asking what I said or did that for. I never answer letters like that; I go on the principle that when a man writes me a letter like that, the satisfaction which he has given himself is the main purpose of the letter, and he has had that. But all trifling apart, it becomes a serious question.

And now we come back to the two commandments of which I spoke at the beginning. These two mean a great deal in order to make the prophetic ministry genuinely Christian, to make mysticism and the inner experience of mysticism Christian, to make those inner experiences lead out to a higher and better value of men, and to make the constant doing of good the instrument and agency for the final revelation of God in the vast multitudes of redeemed humanity.

PREACHING AND PERSONAL PROBLEMS

BURRIS ATKINS JENKINS

Two electrical contacts all the time pull the preacher in two opposite directions—books and people; yet it takes both nodes to complete the galvanic circuit. The minister tugs against the drawing power of both; when with books, the people call; and when with the people, books call.

> Verily, he could sing,
> "How happy could I be with either,
> Were t' other dear charmer away!"

Often he says to himself, "What I would not that I do; and what I would, that I do not."

What I am concerned with to-day is the second of these electric poles—people. One never loses homiletic time when talking to people—not if he is alert and human, that is, sympathetic. After all, the most fascinating book in the world is a human being. God seems to have chosen not a book but a Man through whom most adequately to reveal himself. If the preacher gives time to the problems of the people, he casts bread upon the waters which will come back, maybe after many days, to feed his pulpit—this to look at the matter from a purely self-regarding point of view, without thinking of the good he may do to the people who

come seeking him or whom he may go to seek. If, as Theodore Munger once said to me, the preacher dies just so much upon the cross every time he ascends his pulpit; so may it be true that he spends himself just so much every time he wrestles with a problem, soluble or insoluble, of someone who may be in straits or in despair. At the same time every veteran minister knows that he saves his own life just in proportion as he pours it out.

Nowadays, in the cities at least, the preacher becomes increasingly an office practitioner. Not so much now does he go to the people; and more and more the people come to him. He does not call so much as he is called upon. He goes to hospitals and sick-beds, to homes of sadness and loneliness and misfortune, but not to drawing rooms, or kitchenette bed-sitting rooms, or men's offices unless strictly on business. He does not, therefore, ring so many doorbells that would rather rest silent, and does not waste his time where he may not be needed or wanted. If, however, he lets it be known that he sits receptive in his office accessible at fixed hours to all who need to see him, to those who are in anywise afflicted in mind, body, or estate, no specialist in the city, perhaps, will have a longer waiting list than he. Most ministers, I take it, will reserve their forenoons for reading and study and give their afternoons and evenings in one way and another to

the people. Many will come who have no real need, but only wish to loaf, to ride a hobby, to turn their favorite, boring crank. Two places attract nuts more than all others—a newspaper office and a preacher's study. A wise and discriminating doorkeeper, a secretary or assistant, becomes therefore indispensable with an increasing practice in this specialty.

It takes a nice judgment, however, to sort out the important from the unimportant. Sometimes an assistant may think the caller has no vital matter to talk about, when he has. Sometimes the experienced pastor may have difficulty in deciding. When he becomes sure that the caller comes merely to feed fat his own egotism, short shrift may justly be given to him; but the preacher needs be very sure. Some timid one may only slowly and reluctantly uncover the root of a serious matter.

To get a thing "off the chest" sometimes relieves a tense, not to say tragic, situation. Just to let someone talk about his difficulties often constitutes the pastor's sufficient function. Physicians are growing increasingly conscious of the value of this process of mental catharsis, especially those physicians who treat mostly mental and nervous disease. For some years we held a psychiatric clinic at our church under a graduate—an M.D.—of Johns Hopkins and Vienna; but the medical societies finally began weeding out free

clinics in the city and we had to close this work. The minister must recognize such mental cases for himself and permit the visitor to talk as much as he pleases about his difficulties without too much talk from the preacher himself. Especially is it true that women take twice as many words to tell their stories as men, and, by the same token, probably get twice the amount of relief. The constant temptation of the minister consulted is to break in, interrupt, help to condense. Sometimes, I grant, this may be necessary, but most often it may easily damage the situation. The matter may seem trivial to the minister. It is never trivial to the one seeking help. Warden Lewis Lawes, in his book, *Twenty Thousand Years in Sing Sing*, which is heartily to be recommended to all consulting preachers, shows the necessity of listening to every little thing his "boys" wish to confide to him. Things so little grow so big in the distorted perspective of prison life. And how much of life there is almost as cribbed, cabined, and confined as prison life?

Of course much opportunity for close touch with those in trouble comes in hospitals, when the pastor may go with a patient to the operating room, holding his or her hand as the anæsthetic takes effect. Such things can never be forgotten. In bereavement, it goes without saying that his ministration can be most effective; but may I put in a word here for shorter and better funerals?

As a man's work grows heavier, he should avoid going to cemeteries for the service at the grave. People will content themselves with an assistant, or even a layman who can make a little prayer, provided the busy preacher makes it known that this is his custom. His funeral talk, if there must be one, can be almost in the same words all the time. Also his prayer. At weddings, before the ceremony, the minister usually stands out as the most important figure there; after the ceremony, the least. He can, therefore, usually conserve his time by slipping away at once. Usually no one will miss him. Note writing, done by hand, to persons in trouble, persons in moments of unusual joy, persons whose pictures have appeared in the paper, young people who have been graduated or achieved some little distinction of any kind, may make an everlasting impression; and notes take such a very little time to write. Only a few lines suffice, but they must be hand written.

It cannot, however, be too strongly emphasized that in his office or study the preacher must make himself accessible to the people. He has the right to hold them strictly to his prescribed hours, not to fritter away his whole life; but accessible he must certainly make himself. Publishers of great newspapers know this; politicians, governors, senators—all officeholders know it; shall the children of this world be wiser than those who hope they are the children of light? I can con-

ceive of a time in a man's life when his pulpit ministration becomes so important as to justify him in shutting himself away from individual contacts to a great degree; and yet I wonder if even his pulpit might not suffer from his aloofness, and his sermons grow wrinkled and old from lack of human contact.

What kind of problems do the people bring to the preacher's consulting room? A bewildering variety. Yet, after long experience, the minister will find the same ones recurring over and over again. He will know, increasingly, the remedies to prescribe; and still realize that he must make allowance for differences in personality. Each individual has his own equation, which the minister must seek to solve.

Economic problems loom large, especially at the present moment. People come for help in saving their homes from foreclosure. They come begging for employment. They ask for loans, for transportation, for food, for a physician's treatment. Never in my experience was a time when such a bewilderment of insoluble questions fell like a snowstorm on the head of a consulting pastor. He simply stands helpless in most of these cases, only hoping that he does some good by listening to the tale of woe. He can usually send the distracted petitioner out with a letter of introduction to look for a job, thus furnishing at least a straw of hope. He can send the neediest to

institutions of one kind and another. Personally, I make great use of the Salvation Army, as the most devoted, unselfish, understanding, and sympathetic of all our organized relief effort, at least in my city. All the inventiveness of my office force at this present time is strained to the uttermost to try to find ways of help to these people who are in direst straits through no fault of their own.

One thing will emerge from the hours in the consulting room of an honest preacher to-day, and that is a conviction that America is far from having found the best government and the best industrial and social system on earth. If the preacher is human, concerned, deeply concerned over the woes of the people, his pulpit will feel the effect of his consultations. He can no longer smugly declaim about our land as a Utopia, an Eden on earth, "the land of the free and the home of the brave." Such platitudes will choke him. He will in spite of himself, harden against the few, in the richest nation on earth, who still grab the bread from the many. He will gain in his ideas of a changed economic order, more even distribution of wealth, the chance for every one to work, and to be rewarded according to his efforts. He will increasingly seek for the roots of our difficulties in the super-immorality of the acquisitive motive, in the greed of our real rulers, the excessively rich, in our failure to heed the teaching of the Nazarene

in our foreign relations, and to believe with Saint Paul that all the nations of the earth are one—not one blood, not one nation, not one organism—but one, a unit, an integer. Never in the world before has it blazed forth so clearly that the Great Master knew his economics, his sociology, his statescraft; and that nothing can save the distraught world and the despairing ones in the richest nation in the world except the Golden Rule, the story of the good Samaritan, and the Sermon on the Mount. The Great Dreamer knew what he was talking about.

Next most numerous are the marital cases, wives seeking to solve the problem of living happily with their husbands; and, less frequently, of husbands trying to learn how to get on with their wives. Too often they come too late. Sometimes they can still save their homes. That divorce, however, is about as frequent in America as in Russia; that in the more populous cities of from two hundred thousand on up, fifty per cent of all marriages end in divorce, shows two things, I think: first, we are not so smart in America as we think we are; and, second, perhaps that women particularly—since most divorces are sought by women—are exercising their new-found freedom and experimenting toward a better marriage than we yet have found.

Freud may have been extreme, and Havelock Ellis, still they have taught us much about the

marital relation that we only dimly realized, if at all, before their time. Psychiatrists and gynecologists are adding to our stock of knowledge all the time. These men, and most other physicians, I believe, agree that, in addition to a great many other things, a happy marriage must be built upon a mutually satisfactory physical love-life. Given that foundation, and all the little things, like money matters, social relations, in-laws, can be harmoniously managed. Without that foundation these little molehills grow easily into mountains. Thus a great many consultants come and stress the unimportant, not knowing, or at least not admitting, that the very foundation itself does not stand secure.

Most frequently the fault lies with the man. He has not studied the artistry of love. He does not even know there is such a thing. The average bridegroom does not care for advice. He thinks he knows it all, because he has roistered round town a bit before marriage. I used to make it a practice to spend an hour almost forcing myself upon the intending bridegroom, and sometimes the bride herself, to try to impart to them the rudiments of the art of love. Now I save time by giving them a pamphlet written by a young minister in California which is the best thing I have seen, in small compass, upon the subject. They cost me twelve cents each, but save me five dollars worth of time. And I believe they are read.

Not always, however, does the fault lie with the unskillful husband. Often enough it rests with the wife. Fear of consequences destroys all the beauty and joy of the most important relation in married life. Children are not wanted, or, at least, any more children would be dreaded. How is it possible to abandon herself healthily and joyously with fear hanging like a dragon's shadow over her? Consequently, she rejects her lover, or handicaps him and herself in the expression of their love. Such an attitude, often leading to the direst consequences—unfaithfulness, promiscuity, and even disease on the part of the husband, heartbreak and divorce on the part of the wife, often comes out of ignorance and false modesty. Many wrecked homes and lives might be saved by intelligent consultation before marriage with a physician or with a minister, provided these gentlemen had made an adequate study of the subject. Medical colleges, on account of the Comstock law of 1873, cannot train physicians in birth-limitation, so the education of most of them is neglected. Many of them to have a hesitancy in talking to young people on the subject. I heard one of them, nationally famous for his writings and his speeches, declare on the forum platform of my church that when parents sent their young people to him for instruction in intimate matters, he always felt embarrassed; and he thought that the knowledge they picked up in the streets and alleys was about

as good as any. As long as doctors hold that view, disease and divorce will stay at the top of the curve. Not a great many ministers are any better fitted to discuss these matters helpfully; but it is their own fault with such writers as Robinson and Van de Velde easily accessible. No minister can quite dare to tackle the confessional regarding marital infelicity until he has fitted himself for the task.

More than once I have had to tell a husband that he was an unmitigated fool—prefixing the word with a good lusty English adjective—to shock him into some realization of his ignorance and folly. Once I did that to a man in the presence of his wife. Two weeks later he came back and thanked me. Now both of them—at last happy in each other—sit in my church in the same spot every Sunday morning. One fellow whose wife had come to consult me came a few days later and dramatically handed me his revolver, saying he did not know what he might do to himself or to her if he kept it. I felt inclined to laugh, but knew, on second thought, it might not be a laughing matter. I think that gun is still in the church safe, where most guns ought to be.

The training for marriage should begin clear back in infancy, not in adolescence. Parents, the prekindergarten school, the public schools, pastors and Sunday-school teachers should all be trained to impart the needed training in turn to the young.

Some day it will be done. Then, and not till then, divorce will decrease.

This brings me to the next large group of consultants, parents with wayward children, and young people whose parents do not know how to handle them. Almost invariably the fault lies with the parents. Force, the imposition of superior strength, physical or moral, can never bend the child in the way he should go, but only the opposite way. "Spare the rod and spoil the child" means the fishing rod and no other. Companionship, reasoning, consultation with the child takes longer, much longer, but is the only successful way; and must begin when the child is very young, still in arms, and continue through youth. It is much easier to break him into being a little adult before his time, saves the parents lots of trouble and time, but breaks him just the same. Then when it becomes too late, the parents wonder why the child does not love, honor, and obey. "What have I done," they cry, "to deserve such treatment from my boy or girl?" The minister cannot tell them to go back and begin over at babyhood. He can only take the situation as it is, send for the child, and do a repair job, if he can.

It were far better for most children if they reared themselves. Reared? You cannot rear, or raise, a child anyway; only nature can do that. A little guidance and sweet reason from one who has gone through the process is about all an older

person can give. And for most older persons it becomes literally impossible to put themselves in the children's shoes. They so easily forget that they were ever young. Plenty of rope, then, for the young, with a firm guiding hand, well concealed, must be prescribed. When shall we learn, parents and all of us, that we cannot lead others' lives for them, that we can only stand off and watch and sympathize, and whenever we can, help?

Particularly, perhaps, may it be said of the young that they are slow to uncover their grief. Yes—even in this forthright day. Since a great many people older grown do not always know what is the matter with them, how much more the inexperienced, sometimes inarticulate, and always impressionable young? Robert Louis Stevenson once exclaimed, "Thank God, we shall never have to suffer again as we did when we were young." Astonishing but true that many apparently self-assured and self-assertive young people to-day stand in the shadow of a great loneliness and a great fear, without a clear understanding of them by their elders, without sympathetic companionship, and without a knowledge of what makes their hearts ache.

Rarely does a young bore come to a preacher's study door. No matter how trivial the matter he first spreads before the minister's eyes, be very sure there lies something far more important a

little further down. Besides, there exists so much more chance of doing him a service, discovering for him a solution, or a philosophy that may set his feet upon the road to a solution, than in the case of older patients. The best work a consulting preacher can do, therefore, lies among the young. Lucky for him if he can get the young started to coming to him. Aside from what he can do for them, they can do a priceless service for him—keep him young. That is, unless he has already set, like concrete.

Ten to one the young person begins with something about a theme for his class in English, or an oration or debate he is preparing, or the choice of studies, or a book. Give him time and a sympathetic interest, and soon he may unfold a distressed mind over the choice of a calling in life. How often young boys, particularly, torture themselves, usually too early, over this question. If one can only convince them that the decision can just as easily wait months—even years—he has done them invaluable service. Then, if he can study the young person enough to give gentle hints—oh, very gentle and hesitant—as to his particular capabilities, he may have done still more inestimable good.

Possibly the real difficulty—a boy and girl love affair—may be the slowest of all to come out. Boys, especially, hesitate to seek counsel over such affairs unless tactfully and seriously sounded out.

No such story, however apparently petty or amusing, should ever be listened to without the utmost gravity and sympathy. Who knows whether it may not hold the seeds of a made or a wrecked career, maybe two careers, maybe many more, in it? Who knows when a life itself may be in jeopardy? An outside person touches such a case only at his peril—rather at other people's peril. What a lot of blundering parents, with rough hands, do not hesitate to lay hold upon the tender tendrils of such budding life! A vigorous young minister asked me the question the other day, "What ails the young?" and, before I could attempt to answer him, replied to his own question, "Their parents!" A rather long experience in the preacher's consulting room, or confessional if you wish, leads me to echo his answer.

George Bernard Shaw, when I asked him jokingly to come on and go with us to Russia, in 1929, replied: "I'd love to go. I'd rather go to Russia than anywhere else in the world. In Russia they are teaching their young people morals. Here in England, and in America too, we are teaching young people to get rich, honestly if they can, but if not, then with as little dishonesty as may be, but to get rich." Of course the question arises at once, What are morals for the young? Is it not a matter of relations between boys and girls—dancing, joy-riding, drinking? Certainly. But I agree with Mr. Shaw that, compared with

even flagrant violations of such well-established codes, our underlying paganism in teaching our young that the supreme end of life is the biggest possible income constitutes a greater immorality than anything anywhere on earth. It strikes at the very roots of character. All these other immoralities take root in that one super-immorality.

If this statement holds at all, then it follows at once that, of course, what is the matter with the young is the parents. And not only do American parents din into the ears of the young the necessity to make money, make money, make money, but they subdue their young forcibly or by long, loving pressure—just as painful sometimes as hostile pressure and just as tyrannical—to their own wills in love and marriage, in social life, in choice of studies, schools, colleges, and callings, with the acquisitive motive forever in the ascendant. The gravest problems of the young that the preacher meets spring usually from the unwise and unsympathetic pressure of parents. He must often try to set free these captive young, and to kindle the courage of independence in their hearts. He must do it with the utmost of delicacy and discretion, if he is not to feel the wrath of the parents.

We may think Freud and the psychologists abnormal themselves when they assert an unconscious falling in love between father and daughter or mother and son as a not uncommon occurrence.

But the consulting pastor knows that there exists no other way of explaining the actions of some fathers and some mothers. There is more truth than poetry in *Mourning Becomes Electra.* I know fathers who have fought off the suitors of their daughters almost at the muzzles of shotguns; and I know mothers who have jeopardized the sanity, the normality, and even the lives of their sons by preventing their marriages. These parents do not know what they are doing, do not realize that egotistical jealousy and the grossest selfishness lies at the root of their attitude; and nobody can convince them. Robbie Burns may have been thinking of them when he cried,

> "Oh wad some power the giftie gie us,
> To see oursel's as others see us!"

But nobody, however wise and skilled, can open such unconscious eyes. All one can do is to work on the young themselves and try to free them from tyranny. He may get himself into hot water, but he must take his chances.

Another class who come to the preacher's office is the so-called criminal class, or their relatives and friends. They come seeking his influence for clemency or parole. For one, I never fail to give it; and judges, parole boards, and wardens in my part of the country know that I am always ready to serve as first friend, that is, as supervisor, for any man let out on parole. Almost never have I

been disappointed in a man paroled to me. Most of our errors in the matter of penology are on the side of overseverity. Seldom is a sentence or a prison too lenient. We still remain in the most elementary state in the study of penology. In "barbarous" Russia there is no capital pun sh-ment except for counter-revolution, and no sentence longer than ten years, which is usually scaled down to two or three upon sign of reformation. Modern psychological methods are employed in teaching prisoners; they are really more in a school than in a prison. Warden Lawes, of Sing Sing Prison, although he has had to execute one hundred and fifty men and one woman, does not believe in capital punishment.

Men just out of prison have the heaviest load to carry of any human beings I know. They are followed, watched, often hounded by the police, to say nothing of the populace. They need a friend if anybody does. Yet I have men in my acquaintance, even in my church, who have done time, and now are among the most valuable citizens in the community.

The world is full of sadness, sorrow, frustration, loneliness, and pain. Almost nobody in America is happy. We are called a sad people by close observers in the older parts of the earth. Almost nobody comes seeking the minister who has not an aching or a broken heart. And almost no preacher becomes a veteran who does not echo

the words, "If I had my life to live over again I would preach more to the broken-hearted." Well, there are other ways to minister beside preaching; and the face-to-face method, maybe, contains the greater efficacy of the two. Who knows? Jesus apparently preferred it.

If one can restore something of the lost radiance of the Christian religion, as Principal Jacks put it in words that have become almost classic; if he can show to the broken-hearted something of the illuminating power of the companionship of Christ; if he can light up an incandescence in hearts that are dark and bowed down; and if he can at the same time untangle a few of the knots and snarls in which people's lives have become enmeshed, he may feel that his hours in the consulting room do not all end in futility.

The real preacher, after all, concerns himself pre-eminently with people—his books are only a means to that end. He will not find his accessibility a burden, however the long series of conferences may weary him, if he bears in mind that he lives to minister, but will go home, it may be physically jaded, but none the less compensated. He will find his mind enriched for his Sunday message by the secrets opened to him in human hearts, got off the chest, and will wonder if he has gained in skill so that in some measure he can answer the cry of Macbeth to the doctor who had come to wait upon his distracted lady,

"Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perious stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?"

He will walk into hospitals and sick-rooms with an added sympathy and efficiency. He will even rejoice with them that do rejoice with a deeper sincerity and sense of relief and congratulation. He will take all the problems that come to him—economic, marital, parental, punitive—with a healing understanding that grows wider with the years and deal with them with a more practiced hand; and the marvel of the Master's magic touch, so full of healing, will grow greater and more satisfying in his own soul, as the best guerdon of all his toil.

PREACHING AND THE INNER KINGDOM

CHARLES WESLEY BURNS

ONE of our modern essayists speaks of the "eternal pathos of a changing world." A tragic figure in modern life is the man from whom the times have rolled away, leaving him a poor "pathetic anachronism," bolstered up by the ideals of another age. It is of such a man that Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, who "traveled on the strength of a dead fact." If we lived in a static world, this occasion would have no significance beyond any other like occasion, but ours is a dynamic world in a dynamic age. We are told that the marks of Time are more legibly written in Boston, where we meet, than in any other city of the Eastern shore. There the slow, pensive tale that is the unwinding of birth and change and death and birth again lies clear upon the pattern of existence. "To-day is not a fresh adventure, born of the sun climbing out of the sea. It is an accumulation of ten thousand yesterdays;" but the yesterdays are swept away in the rush of the to-morrows. There is a new daydawn, but the daydawn is in the heart, and not on the horizon.

All are agreed that we have come to a turning

point in human destinies. We are passing through the real processes of a new era. We have passed out of the period of astonishment at the world cataclysm into a period of achievement. What is the significance of this crisal hour? Scores of books are written about it. Everyone feels that "the embattled democracies of the world," and now the disarming democracies of the world, have brought vast cataclysmic and immeasurable changes. Ramified reconstructions are imminent in society, in commerce, in industry, in organized Christianity. What are those changes? What has happened? What will come out of the social and industrial ferment of the day? What is the outlook for peace? Is the world neighborhood being transformed into a World Brotherhood? What chance has Jesus Christ in the New Day dawning?

The theological, social, industrial, and international bewilderment has caused many to ask whether civilization and Christianity will survive. In our confusion of mind, we are very like the hero in one Stephen Leacock's *Nonsense Novels* who "mounted his horse and immediately rode rapidly in all directions." It was an Emersonian remark that we do not begin to study geology until the day after the earthquake. Our present bewilderment has shocked us to a new evaluation of motives and men and nations and races.

Hutton, in his book *The Proposal of Jesus*, writes that the most determinative thing in his

young ministry was a remark of Gilbert Chesterton. When about to seek lodgings, he said it was his custom to ask his prospective landlady, not concerning the sheets as to their cleanness, nor the room as to its tidiness, nor the food as to its quality and quantity, nor would he higgle and huckster about the price. He looked the landlady squarely in the eyes, and asked her this question, "What is your total view of the universe?" Now, the sparking point of this remark is this, that if one's total view of the universe is right, it follows that one's view of all minor relationships of life will be right. The present battle is not between Science and Religion, nor society and politics, but between the contending and conflicting philosophies of life. These involve a right view of the world-ground and the world-motive that is behind education and religion.

Dr. McKenzie King, in his great and fundamental treatise on *Industry and Humanity*, senses the international unrest and world ferment in a fresh allusion to Mrs. Shelley's *Frankenstein*, written a little more than one hundred years ago. A weird and realistic parable it is indeed, but true to modern life. Are we not chained to the Iron Man of modern life, a "Frankenstein" more powerful than the genius who created him? Are we not suffering the supreme tragedy of history because of that very genius? Is it not that very materialistic system which has brought about a

shattered, broken, and bruised world-heart and has let loose in the world a monster of hate and fear and conflict in industry, in society, in international relationships that strikes terror to the very heart of the race?

With the evidence everywhere of the breakdown of the old and the birth of a new world; with the confused voices calling out of the fog of politics, society, industry, education, and religion, it is refreshing to turn to a study of Jesus' philosophy and plans. His philosophy was of an entirely different order from that of American thought to-day. His emphasis was first personal, then social, then spiritual. "Personality is power" was the motif of his teaching.

Aye, personality is power—not organizations nor societies; not institutions nor laws; not forces; but personality. Linked to material things, it is industrial power; linked to humanity, it is social power; linked to thought, it is intellectual power; linked to God, it is spiritual power. But always personality is power. Luther was the power back of the German Reformation that quickened the conscience of Germany and leavened the imagination of all Europe. John Knox, with his piercing gray eyes and shaggy brows, his mighty warm heart, "dinging the pulpit into blads" at old Saint Giles, preaching his evangel before peasants and kings, was the power back of the Scottish Reformation that not only gave direction and impulse

to Protestantism everywhither, but made the educational map of the world. John Wesley was the power back of the greatest evangelical impulse ever let loose in the world. Paul was the power back of the great world movement of the founding of the Kingdom. Christ was Christianity. Personality is power.

Professor Deissmann, in *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul,* asks a very significant and penetrative question in one of his chapters: "What new thing did Jesus bring?" It was not his teaching, nor in the field of doctrine. It was, rather, on a dynamic plane—namely, that His teaching was with authority. It was his personality. His own peculiar energy in his experience of the living God that was new. "It is not his concepts that are original, but his power; not his formulæ, but his convictions; not his dogmas, but his faith; not his system, but his personality. . . . The new epoch-making thing is himself. In the time of the earliest Christian theology, Irenæus answered to this same question of Marcionites: What new thing did Jesus bring? with the words 'Omnem novitatem attulit semet ipsum afferens'—'He brought all that was new in bringing himself.'"[1]

Deissmann thinks that the Kingdom was a mirror of Jesus himself, and that two pieces of knowledge of greatest importance for the present

[1] Reprinted by permission of Harper & Brothers, publishers.

day are these: first, the Kingdom is not something finished and ready for us, but an immense task for the present and future. The Kingdom is still to come. Second, the kingdom of God is not simply a matter of the other world, but is a new condition of affairs in this world produced by power from the other world.

What else did Jesus mean in that solemn moment when he paused in the roadway and halted his little band, standing before them, tall, wan, and tired, looking at their flushed faces, into their eyes, and deep down into their souls in silent rebuke or their quarrel in the way as to who should be the greatest in the Kingdom and the outer form of power it should take? With quiet intensity, but ringing challenge, Jesus said to that little band of men, sun-browned, with loyal hearts, but bewildered minds, "The kingdom of God is in *you*." The Kingdom is not in Jerusalem, not in the Temple, not in the observances of the law, not in an attempt to take from the shoulders of the Jews the galling, irritating, chafing yoke of the Romans, not in any social or political program—the Kingdom is in you. What? The Kingdom in men, founded on changing human hearts and fickle human nature? Not in the church? In no institution? In no dogma? In no theology? In no fabric of creed? In no social program? No, in man, in the radiated life of the Christ transmitted to his disciples. Upon the

human heart, he founded his Kingdom. Divinity clothed itself in humanity. The Redeemer invested himself in personality.

From the foregoing, these propositions seem fairly just conclusions:

First, the philosophy of Christ is the supreme social solvent and dynamic of good will. The church's progress has been from the individual emphasis on an evil world to a social emphasis with personalism dropped out. The need of the hour is a synthesis of the two into a spiritual brotherhood.

Dr. Timothy Tinfang Lew, dean of the School of Religion at Yenching University, Pekin, on a recent Thanksgiving Day in the Oakland Auditorium spoke of the "divided Christianity partly responsible for a divided China and the confused national ideals. The contorted Western culture must be fused into a brotherhood apart from creed, color, or race. The personal Christ is the only power equal to this."

The belief of the Church in Christ as the only social solvent is being authenticated by its help in solving industrial problems, purifying the political atmosphere, elevating the standards of the street, correcting the social evils, eliminating perils of vice and darkness. It has translated into modern speech and into modern practice a new type of social evangelism. Here is a fine word from a social redemptionist: "A great moral revival

seems to be sweeping over the civilized world. It is not like the old emotional revival. It hears the cry of oppressed childhood, and hastens to its aid. It rises in indignation against the corrupt granting of municipal contracts; it calls attention to the sacrifices of life and limb by the absence of safety devices on machinery. It fights battles for the conservation of our natural resources. It mitigates the hardships of the shop girl by appeals to consumer and employer. In a thousand ways, it enters the factory, knocks at the halls of government, insists on being heard in the room of the Board of Directors. The ideals and principles of Christianity, it assures us, must be carried into the problem of our modern life."

Many are asking "What part has the church in this new crusade?" Various are the answers. Some reply that it is doing valiant service because in the hour of devotion and prayer it furnishes men with the incentive and resolve and vision of righteousness that issue in social reform. There are some who denounce and repudiate the church entirely because the ministers do not lay aside their cassocks and their black coats and in shirt sleeves, with bare arms, go out into the dust and strain of the conflict. There is general consent of conviction that whatever method the church shall pursue, it must face the problems of the age or go down. In that modern battle and that modern Augean stable, the church as a whole is bearing a

noble part and with evangelistic passion has awakened to a social vision.

The whole of the church has not thus awakened. There are many drowsy souls and sluggish hearts who do not respond to the call of the age to go forth from the altar equipped with the passion of life. They have been so long in the dim religious light of the sanctuary that their eyes are blinded to the needs of the street. They have been so long before the altar that their very faith has become flabby, pale, and anemic. Any summons to service, any bugle call to conquest, any appeal from the trenches for volunteers seems to them to be irreligious. They do not wish to be disturbed in their comfortable worship. The martial note has been lost from their souls. The dreams of faith to such are only dreams. The vision of the City of God among men is only a vision. The hope of social salvation is only a hope. Such indolent, dull-souled discipleship stands before the grieved eyes of the Christ who taught men to put their hands to the plow, to work in the vineyard, to bear burdens, to minister to needs, to deal righteously, to deny self daily, to see in every need a divine opportunity for service, and asks "when saw we *Thee*, and did not minister to Thee?"

Wells speaks vascular words when he declares that the tragedy of the modern Christian world is this, "that our hearts are too small for the Galilæan." His is the better way. His is the only

way to world power and world peace. His personality is redeeming and uniting power.

Second, the Christian social order comes as men bring it in their hearts.

Our century is like unto the first. It is strikingly true that the problems that confronted Jesus are the problems that confront us. The air was filled with questions—political, social, economic, ecclesiastic, international. They brought to him the ever-recurring problem of the right distribution of property. Evils lifted their hoary heads on every side—slavery, Roman tyranny, social evils, intemperance, false customs, economic tragedies. No age had more problems than the age of Jesus. But to him there was but one problem, and that was the problem of the human heart. When Jesus lived, war was universal; two thirds of the race were slaves; three fourths were drunkards; nine tenths led openly impure lives. Men and women sneered as they passed statues of Venus. Purity was almost unknown. Search the gospel story from beginning to end, and you will not find one word of Jesus against social impurity, nor a word against drunkenness, nor a word against slavery, nor a word against war. He did not lift his voice, nor cry from the street corners. He did not rail against the evils of the day. What does it mean that the embodiment of all purity, the divine impulse of all social regeneration, the dynamic of all human goodness

did not grip the so-called problems of the day, and had no programs for reformation, no solutions for the world's evils, no zeal for the great social movements of the day? It means just this, that Jesus saw that the great problem was the problem of sin; that the estrangement of the heart from God was the root of all tragedy; that the rebellion of the soul against the good Father was the source of all woes. He saw that back of the manifestations and the outcroppings of evil was the human heart. Out of the heart proceedeth the evil of the world, and he gave his life to provide a cure. It follows from such philosophy as this that any movement that will redeem society, any program for the salvation of the race, any scheme for the uplift of humanity, any plan for world-brotherhood, any system of social justice, any solution of industrial maladjustment, must be born of a motive that reaches men's hearts and changes their lives. The salvation of society is in direct ratio to the salvation of individuals who compose society. The redemption of the race is dependent upon the redemption of the units who compose the race. Always and forevermore personality is power. Because Jesus saw further than anyone else, saw life more clearly and steadily and as a whole, he went on founding his kingdom upon human hearts. The prophets aimed at social and political reforms, but never Jesus. He placed the emphasis upon right living.

Does not James Truslow Adams say: "There is no use in railing at America, or expecting her to take her proper position in the world, unless each of us as citizens makes an effort to make his own life worth while on the basis of values which are not wholly material, and strives to make the life of the nation truly great and not merely a standard of living at so many thousands a year. The nation cannot transcend the level of its citizens."

Dr. John McDowell, newly appointed secretary of Social and Industrial Relations of the Presbyterian Church, writes that "One searches the New Testament in vain for any ready-made systems of any kind, whether ecclesiastical, social, or economic. The Christ of the New Testament is not a legislator or a deviser of social or economic schemes. He left nothing like a code of rules for the individual or for society. He furnished us with the constitution of the kingdom of God, but not with the by-laws of the Kingdom; these he expected the citizens of the Kingdom to work out for themselves, in every realm of human activity. The followers of Christ are not committed to any propaganda save that of principles. Methods will evolve. Principles will create them. . . . We need better social and economic methods; still more do we need better men."

As a world-reformer, Jesus aimed at a new social order, but it was not an abstract society, it was

concreted in folks. Reconstruct people, and you have reconstructed society. Professor Steiner's latest suggestion is that "Perhaps the social gospel failed because there was not enough gospel in it, because it did not declare emphatically enough, if at all, that nothing was of importance, neither machines nor money nor skyscrapers nor Gothic churches, not even the social gospel, if it did not change men from brute to child of God, from enemy to brother."

Jesus abolished slavery, outlawed war, by creating new hearts; his new heaven and new earth were first new hearts and new minds. It is the doctrine of Jesus that produces the type of character that puts an end to wrongs—chattel-slavery, wage slavery, and slavery of greed and appetite. His Golden Rule applied will bring the Golden Age. This is the only way out for society in its industrial, social, national, and international relations. There is no other way. The Kingdom of holiness, the Kingdom of helpfulness, the Kingdom of justice, the Kingdom of peace, the Kingdom of good will is in you!

Third, in timely application, a warless world will come as men develop warless hearts. The Romans had taken the fight out of the Jews of Jesus' day. Their shoulders and hearts were galled with oppression and tyranny. They were not a warrior folk, but hatred slumbered in their hearts. In a day reeking with Roman militarism

he not only forbade to kill, but commanded his followers to love their enemies and pray for their revilers. He taught and exemplified the "other cheek" and the "second mile." He pronounced a blessing on those who sought to achieve peace. He was not only the Prince of Peace, but to him we trace the ancestry of peace. All life was sacred, therefore all war was wicked. The imagery of the Kingdom was of swords gleaming bright as plowshares and all nations at peace forming a Christly kingdom. Too many of our preachers have more sermons on war than on peace. A Kingdom of peace among men is deeper than the reach of resolution, the barring-of-war gestures, and the pointing out of the failure of militarism to make peace. The will to peace is first born of love. The warless Kingdom will never come by proclaiming a "white, Protestant, American, native-born God." The Kingdom is in hearts—not some kinds of hearts. The education of public opinion must come by correction of heart attitude. A love of man must be followed further into a love of humanity. The World War shook the world profoundly, but it shook it together. Our neighborliness now must be followed by brotherliness or a greater disaster. Nor may we expect much help from the churches, until the heart of the church is changed, turning from its aggressive attitude toward war and toward the positive dynamic of good will.

Jesus taught that wars and murders were in the heart. They grew out of fear, ignorance, suspicion, hate. A warless world can come only through warless hearts. Reconstruct folks, and you reconstruct a nation. Build a new people, and you build new governments. A Christianized people presupposes a Christianized social order. Obedience to Jesus leads to a reconstructed character and a reconstructed society of good will. The warless world must begin with *you!*

Is there any other way to end conflicts between nations? Ten million boys died in a war to end war. Thousands had New Testaments in their pockets over their hearts. They tried another way. They broke through the Hindenburg line. But crosses, row on row, mark their graves and rise in revolt against the futility of force.

Charles Rann Kennedy, in a one-act drama called *The Terrible Meek*, with fine dramatic sense writes against force as an instrument of social and spiritual progress. In the drama the chief figures are a woman, a soldier, a captain and three gaunt crosses against a drab sky on which are hanging three men—"One of them like unto the Son of man." He is a martyr to the fallacy that force is an instrument of progress. He is being killed by the men he called brothers. "Through a peculiar kind of fear they call courage" they have killed him. Mob psychology has prevailed, and mob hate. Blind Samsons have pulled down the pil-

lars of the social order. Violence has done its worst. Hatred has done its worst. Racial antagonism has done its worst. Then, in lofty dramatic values, love is introduced as the antidote to the sin of force. Looking across the hill to the light in radiance round the cross and the dawning of a new day, "It's coming light again," said the soldier. "Eternally," said the captain. Force? Futile! Love? Irresistible! And love is Kingdom-built in the heart!

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL AND WORSHIP

FRED WINSLOW ADAMS

"THE Social Gospel and Preaching!" That sounds perfectly consistent. But let it read, "The Social Gospel and Worship!" and there seems to be introduced a contrast. It is the old antithesis of priest or prophet, salvation by faith or by works, salvation individual or social, and now of the social gospel or worship. In all these contrasts we are coming to realize that "it is not so much either or, as both and." To be sure, there are still belated worshipers who have little use for the social gospel, and some social gospel-ers who have even less understanding of worship. Twenty years ago I heard the then famous Dr. Lyman Abbott, of Brooklyn, say, "You social workers are perfectly lovely to everybody except Christ; and you cut him dead!" And even to-day some social proponents speak of worship as a soporific mysticism. But in reality can there be any social gospel without worship? Not if we mean by "gospel" the good news of Jesus. The gospel of Jesus is a spiritual challenge calling for creative expression in the worship of God and in social reconstruction.

I propose to discuss this subject around the

three words—Relationship, Leadership, and Direction.

I. The Relationship

Can worship have a creative part in social reconstruction? That seems to necessitate some definition of "worship." As here used, and put in simplest terms, worship consists in those conscious attitudes by which we experience God. Then, "Where," do you ask, "is the social implication?" It is in the very term "God." Let us expand the definition, as Professor Brightman has done, to conscious attitudes of reverent contemplation, revelation, communion and fruition, finding creativity in a new perspective, in a spiritual ideal, in freedom and in a Community of Love. So conceived, worship is the very heart of religion. So conceived, it is through worship that the life blood must flow in social and redeeming service. For it is through corporate, common, congregational, public worship that mankind may reach that freedom and attain those spiritual levels which enable the individual to see "not his fellow worshipers only, but all mankind, as a potential Community of Love."[1]

Thinking thus of worship we are not primarily discussing rites, rituals, symbols, and ceremonies. Worship is not limited to services conducted in some lovely rural chapel by the wayside, or in

[1] *Religious Values*, by Edgar Sheffield Brightman, p. 223. The Abingdon Press, 1925.

some great cathedral "where cross the crowded ways of life." Jesus declared long ago that the time was at hand when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem would men be worshiping the Father, for, said he, "God is Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Yet even private devotion may have its time and place and method of prayer. This is actually ritual. And the necessity of ritual becomes the more apparent when two or three or more come together for worship. Then there must be some uniform procedure, whether it be as simple as a silent Quaker meeting, with its hand-shaking benediction, or as elaborate as a Roman Catholic mass, with its elevation of the Host. Both are ritual worship. But the essential thing is not the means in use but whether such means become corridors down which the Spirit may move, whether the things of worship tend to bring us into a vital experience of God, and through that experience into vital reactions of social responsibility.

In considering the social gospel and worship, then, we are primarily concerned with relationships and implications between the act of worship and the acts of social reconstruction, between loving God with all the mind, soul, and heart, and loving our neighbors as ourselves. These two belong together where Jesus placed them; and our relationship to our fellow man in justice, righteous-

ness, and good will should be the outflow of the fountain of worship. But if this is actually to happen, there must be much heart-searching on the part of our worship. There will need to be a revival of religion in our own thinking and estimate of values. On the other hand, justice alone will not suffice. Shakespeare, though not a theologian, spoke with truer insight than most theologians of his day when he said:

> "Though justice be thy plea, consider this,
> That in the course of justice none of us
> Should see salvation; we do pray for mercy;
> And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
> The deeds of mercy."

Not in the course of justice, not in the course of Socialism or capitalism, of Communism or nationalism, Sovietism or individualism, fascism, Hitlerism, or any other political or economic ism shall we find salvation; save as in prayer, save as in common worship, save as in the Spirit of Jesus, we learn to work out our own salvation in reverence and awe. Personal redemption is the unit of social redemption.

Worship, then, is not an antithesis to the social gospel; it is certainly not what Professor Davis called it yesterday, an adjunct to the social gospel.[1] Worship is the very heart, source, and fountain of the social gospel. You may have

[1] See Chap. II in this book, "Communism's Challenge to Christianity."

Socialism without worship, or Communism, or any other economic ism, but not the social gospel, not the good news of Jesus.

The private and public worship of God lies at the heart of all Christian social progress, as it lies at the heart of our preaching, our evangelism, and our missionary passion. The very existence of the church depends upon such worship. What we need most is to see to it that our worship is socially directed, and then to undergird our whole social program with the dynamic of Christian experience, that experience that comes through the worship of God.

II. The Leadership

Thus it is apparent how much depends upon leadership. So important is this matter of leadership in worship that Dwight L. Bradley, pastor of the Newton Center Congregational Church and teacher of worship in the Newton Theological Institute, declares that the outstanding opportunity set before the modern minister is not the challenge of the social gospel, nor of pastoral service, nor the enrichment of services of public worship, nor the problems of creed and theology, nor the moral problems of daily living, but, rather, the challenge of leadership in worship, and especially the leadership of young people.[2] If this

[2] *Creative Worship*, Dwight Bradley, p. 1. Commission on Evangelism and the Devotional Life, National Council of Congregational Churches.

seems a strong statement, it is well to keep in mind that those who are leading us in worship have as yet too little vision of the necessity of social reconstruction. It is also well to reflect that at least half the people who attend our churches for public worship have no other contact with the church. That is their one means of spiritual nourishment. Again, we need to bear in mind that the church is the only institution on earth whose business it is to offer opportunity for the worship of God. Oh, I grant you, there are other institutions and many other places for the preaching of sermons. You may hear sermons over the radio. You will find sermons in the editorial pages of newspapers and magazines. Men are preaching to us to-day in college halls and on soap boxes, in novels and in great poetry, in the forum and in the movies, but the church is the one institution devoted to the worship of God. And this is its distinctive business. We are often told that worship is divorced from man's social needs. On the contrary, the very rising of a church spire, holding aloft the cross, above the clang and clamor of the city street has a spiritual influence we cannot afford to discount in a day in which a scientist like Sir Arthur Stanley Eddington tells us that "the time has come for us to pause and give way to a spiritual perception of the universe." One should read Dean Sperry's chapter on "Public Worship," in his volume on *Reality in Worship*, to get the real

significance of the values of the sanctuary. He puts it like this:

"Christianity holds that the inclination and the will to practice the brotherhood of man depend upon the constant adoration of God the Father. If men were to cease to worship God, the greatest single incentive to fraternal ways among men would be withdrawn. . . . If the church does nothing else for the world other than to keep open a house, symbolic of the homeland of the human soul, where in season and out of season men reaffirm their faith in this universal Fatherhood of God, it is doing the social order the greatest possible service, and no other service which it renders society can compare in importance with this. . . . The offices of public worship which seem so often to have nothing to say to the ordering of the brotherhood of man, have everything to say to it. They say the one thing which redeems all Utopian thinking from the charge of idle fancy, that God is the bond between man and man."[3]

Now, I am not unmindful of the charges that are brought against our modern worship, that it is an opiate, a way of escape from reality, mere mysticism, a false peace, a substitute of the æsthetic for the spiritual. As Dr. George A. Coe says in a recent editorial in *The World To-morrow:* "The movement for the enrichment of worship,

[3] From *Reality in Worship*, by Willard L. Sperry, p. 165. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925.

and the return to the Gothic, the most conspicuous current development in American Protestantism, is particularly open to question." Then he adds:

"What is the relation of this movement to our social emergency? Do we here behold religion entering into social change, creating social change, transforming therefore the content of devotional thinking and redirecting religious emotion? Is there repentance for being religious in the sense which yesterday gave to religion? Who worships in the temple by means of these liturgies? Are the persons who most smart under injustice sitting in the pews and speaking from the pulpit? Who pays the added expense of our enriched worship, and how did the givers of money obtain it? What spiritual relation among men is established or confirmed by giving and receiving this money? Whose hands quarried from the hillside the stones that composed these walls? Was there any experience of God in the quarrying, dressing, and putting into place of these stones?"

These are searching questions, but none too searching. They emphasize the very point I am stressing, the prime importance of leadership in worship. That we are having a socially minded leadership in just such Gothic Protestant cathedrals with their enriched liturgies, might be instanced in the cases of the new Gothic Riverside Baptist Church in New York, the new Gothic

First Congregational Church in Columbus, Ohio, and the Gothic reconstruction of the First Methodist Church of Evanston, Illinois; and few will gainsay that the ministers of these churches, Harry Emerson Fosdick, McIlyar Hamilton Lichliter, and Ernest Fremont Tittle, are among the most socially minded preachers of our generation. It would be easy to extend this list, from Massachusetts Bay to the Golden Gate, including Wesley Church, Worcester; Trinity, Springfield; Epworth Euclid, Cleveland; and the churches of some of the speakers of this Conference. And is not this in large part the answer? Nor is Doctor Coe's criticism necessarily limited to church architecture and liturgies of worship. It might also include beautiful Gothic theological school buildings and chapels where teach George A. Coe, Harry F. Ward, Reinhold Niebuhr, Jerome Davis, Halford E. Luccock, men whom we love when we cannot follow, and follow when we can. The criticism is in reality an indictment of the social order. Indeed, we might go further and point to the social experiment being carried on in atheistic Russia, under a leadership whose only rite of worship is standing with bowed head before the embalmed face of a fallen leader. It would be a confusing thing if Communism should come to show more of the social passion of Jesus than the church that bears his name. Or, for that matter, it would certainly be challenging if the little brown prophet

who worships at the altar of Hinduism should show a sublimer spirit of sacrifice for the untouchables of India than the Christian leadership of America is showing for the victims of race prejudice, child labor, unemployment, and other injustices of our present social order. It would be revealing if the most thoroughgoing social experiment of our day should turn out to be the kingdom of God movement in Japan under the leadership of that little Christian crusader, Kagawa. It is an hour for the prophet to ascend his throne and cry aloud: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee life!"

When these words were uttered, we were in the midst of a political campaign in which we were told that the issues at stake were more momentous than at any time since the Civil War. But it is something more than an economic program that we need to save us. It is something more than a new social order that we need, badly as we may need that. It is something more than an application of the ethic of Jesus to present-day problems that we need. We need beyond all else the spirit of Jesus. We need that which worship gave to Jesus in the deserts, on the mountainside, in the retreats with little groups of disciples, and in the public worship of the synagogue on the Sabbath day, a leadership born out of a vital experience of God, and carried out in a Christian social order.

Our fathers had something in their worship

that we lack—an utter and intense conviction. To them God was real. To them Christ was a living experience. To them prayer opened the gates of heaven. To them worship was a season of profound reality. Yet much in their leadership of worship was uncouth and limited in its theology and social vision. It is without appeal to our day, and even repellent to our youth. But if we could carry over into our intellectualism and into our culture their emotional conviction, their sanctified mysticism, together with the full social responsibilities involved in leadership in worship, we might again make our worship as dynamic as in the days of the Wesleyan Revival, and as creative for social reconstruction as our day demands.

III. The Direction

We have little to hope for from more tinkering to enrich our services of worship. On the other hand, the reawakening of the spirit of worship in our churches, and the addressing of ourselves to a better ordering and conduct of our public services are, as President Albert W. Palmer has declared, the most heartening facts of contemporary life.[4] That our worship should be a recapitulation of our Christian experience is of importance, and that it should be a cultural, an artistic recapitulation is also important, and that this experience should be in harmony with the historic experience of the

[4] *Paths to the Presence of God*, p. 67. The Pilgrim Press.

church and that it should be socially minded is no less important.

But until forms of worship have wings for social idealism the prophet's flight will be stalled. The vision of the prophet must be conserved in the liturgies of the priest if it is to be of abiding value. The whole emphasis of the social gospel, the new understanding of the ethic of Jesus, the labor movement, the peace movement, and kindred civic, interracial, and international movements have as yet little place in our liturgies, our symbolism, our rituals of worship. For the most part the worship in our so-called liturgical churches deals with the historic past to the exclusion of the living present, deals with ancient Jewish psalms and Hebraic canticles and outworn dogmas. This gives a certain historic background, I grant you, but it preserves almost exclusively the synoptic element in the Christian tradition. The Johannine or Hellenic element, which through incarnation brings God intimately into all the relations of the life we now live, has been tragically omitted. To create a new liturgy that shall speak the language of this new age, and interpret its social and liberal trends, without losing the lyric and mystical notes, is a priestly task that the modern minister well may covet. It is the direction worship needs to take.

It might lead to the working out of a new Church Year. The Anglican Christian Year is admirably

suited to the Middle Ages when it continues such terminology as its Septuagesima Sunday, its Sexagesima and Quinquagesima Sundays. But its motivation of the year about the life, work, and teaching of Jesus has spiritual values too great for us to willingly lose. One might demur at its naming twenty-three to twenty-eight Sundays after the dogma of the Trinity as hardly attuned to present-day thinking. A Christian Year which added to the motivation of the life, works, and teaching of Jesus that of the rise and expansion of the Christian Church might bring its inspiration more fully into our own day. In place of the long Trinity season, for a single instance, Labor-tide might be introduced from Labor Day to Advent, carrying the emphasis of the social gospel from one day on through two months, with additional stress on the social appeals that could come from All Saints, Armistice, and Thanksgiving Days.

The creation of a liturgy that represents our present-day experiences and social aspirations calls for hymns and prayers of the social awakening. In the hymns we are making only a beginning. In the prayers we at once hail Walter Rauschenbusch as a John the Baptist. But we must make place for such prayers in our liturgies. We need prayers of national repentance. At the same time we must guide and strengthen the place of free prayer as over against liturgical. We

need a Psalter which shall be a recapitulation of Christian experience, but which shall contain not alone the experience of the psalmists of old, but social songs of the prophets as well. And why not psalms and *Te Deums* of some of the great Christians since, like Saint Luke, Saint Paul, Saint Francis, Thomas à Kempis, on down to the great Christian social psalmists of our own day? If we are to continue the use of creeds, why not affirmations we believe and understand, and which carry Jesus' emphasis of love? Do you realize that not a single historic creed of the church makes any mention of the all-essential principle of love—neither the Athanasian, Nicene, nor Apostles', great intellectual formulations as these are? Why not, then, a creed declaring our faith in love of God, and in the brotherhood of man? I introduced such a creed in the worship of Trinity Church, Springfield, written by Dr. William G. Ballentine, which attempts to state faith, not in terms of the theologians of the early church, but in terms of the Spirit and teaching of Jesus. Its words are:

I believe that God loves us like a Father, that he hears prayer, that he gives food to the hungry, strength to the weak, comfort to the sorrowful, light to those in darkness, and forgiveness to the penitent.

I believe in loving my neighbor as myself, in doing to others as I would be done by, and in helping those in distress regardless of race or religion.

I believe that God looks upon kindness to a child as a personal favor to himself.

I believe that service to others gives the truest happiness and that service is the measure of greatness.

I believe in the forgiveness of injuries.

I believe that love and peace will finally prevail on earth, and I look for unending life after death. Amen.

We need liturgies of Silence. Kirby Page has a chapter in his *Living Creatively* which he calls "Great Vision and Serenity Through Silence," from which I cull this insight:

"If a man cares intensely about human need, is resolutely endeavoring to remove injustice, and is with regularity spending time in quiet meditation, he will become not only more certain of the validity of faith, but will enter into a progressively satisfying experience of companionship of God."[5] Here is worship through silence which we need in our public services. We may learn much from the Society of Friends, not a little from that great soul Gandhi, whose periods of silent worship are his power house for social leadership, and most of all from the Master:

"O Sabbath rest by Galilee
O calm of hills above
Where Jesus knelt to share with thee
The Silence of eternity
Interpreted by love."

[5] From *Living Creatively*, p. 38. By Kirby Page. Farrar and Rinehart, New York.

And how we have neglected beauty! One of our present-day philosophers goes so far as to declare that the religious experience of beauty in public worship quickens the prophetic vision through an intimate and profound experience of God, makes us aware of a reality richer and deeper and more marvelous than anything we can dream of or conceive, and inspires us to cleanse our hearts and give our lives with new spirit and purpose to those ideals which shall create the best possible world. Beauty opens the gates and lets the love of Christ shine through.[6]

So Angela Morgan experienced beauty one day at worship in a little chapel in Springfield. The Gothic lines, the lift of the arches, the singing colors of the windows brought a sense of the Great Beyond within and escaped from her heart in song:

"Only a step from the road,
A league from the toilsome town—
But oh, what hands to lift your load,
What splendor streaming down!
What eloquence of architecture
Pure as forest shade,
The ancient hush of Eden
Lightly on your spirit laid!
The remedy of wings for woe,
Of triumph for despair,
Eternities that breathe and glow
Within the sacred air.

[6] *Methods of Private Religious Living*, by Henry Nelson Wieman, p. 116. The Macmillan Company, New York.

"As though the very heart of God
Had flowered in this place,
Through windows rich as goldenrod
And carvings fine as lace,
His majesty had spoken,
In the beauty of an aisle,
And altars were a token
He had prayed with us a while.

"Only a step from the street,
And the troubled ways of men;
Yet here may God with mortals meet,
And Christ be born again."[7]

So Moses worshiped before the beauty of a burning bush and out of his worship came the moral law. So David worshiped under the beautiful stars of night, and out of his worship came the songs of praise and contrition, which remain one of our chief heritages from the Hebrew race. So Isaiah worshiped in the beauty of Israel's Temple and out of this religious experience of beauty came Israel's social leader whose vision still lures us forward.

For our moral, social and religious leadership we need most of all a continuing experience of God through both private and public worship, and he who leads a people in well directed worship is leading them to the fountain of life whose waters are for the cleansing of the nations.

[7] From Angela Morgan's *Recitals*, p. 87. Used by permission and arrangement with the publishers, The Penn Publishing Company, Philadelphia.

THE PREACHER'S PROFIT

MERTON STACHER RICE

I WANT to consider as a preacher the profits promised, or opportune in this task of ours, the legitimate dividends we preachers have a right to expect.

Paul has a phrase which I very much appreciate, and I like it in the plain wording of the Authorized Version, "Not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved." Moffatt shied off a bit at this crass-sounding word, and wrote in its place the tamer word "advantage." Personally, I much prefer to leave the old translation unspoiled by such a change. There is no reason to denature this very vital verse.

I hold no brief for the preacher. He who has been, and is, faithful at his task needs no defense. I am, however, insistent in my judgment upon our calling that the dividends of our activities shall not fail.

I am little concerned with the matter of salary as related to our work. I am inclined to believe we have heard too much about that already. I am sure too much of our time in our Conference sessions is spent upon matters involved in ministerial support. I wish, of course, it might be true that the underpaid ministry might be corrected,

though I would confess personally I have always been ashamed of myself at every salary I have ever had, and I have had them as small as they are made. Of this I am sure: the preacher, who is a preacher, never did have a thought of striking for higher wages, no matter what he received.

At one of our Michigan Conferences a few years ago we had a report of a young fellow whose salary compelled him to eat peanuts twice a day in substitution for more costly meals. But he declared as he cracked out his meals, that he was fond of peanuts. You can't peanut a real preacher out of his task.

Heroic though we might find the real revelations on the financial side of our work, I want to shake the word "profit" as we share it free from finance. The money wage of the ministry does not draw men to it. Personally, I would fear for the work if the pay-check became a lure. The scant pay of it all has never been a threat that could keep the soul of the real preacher away. Locusts and wild honey was the best one of the most famous received, and sometimes there was a shortage of honey; and it takes a bountiful smear of good honey to keep locusts palatable.

The Christian ministry offers no chance to get rich in a day of riches. It does offer the very largest field of genuine service. There must be something in such a calling that carries a powerful persuasion. What is the profit of the preacher?

Let me turn frankly to our greatest heartbreak and say a thing carried by us all but utterly unappreciated by the mass of our hearers. I believe profoundly in the truth of the gospel with which I have been allowed of God to be put in trust. When I bring myself to declare the great invitation and find that many who listen seem to be merely entertained and comparatively few are moved to active acceptance and sent out to really live the life we preach, I am faced with the evidence of inefficiency in my task that often becomes a questioning wonder. That is the thing that pounds like a sledge at the preacher's heart. In all our great industries if the general manager cannot get dividends, he will be dismissed. He must produce. Can the preacher produce the results he has been assigned? I insist that it is not the question of salary that drives the soul of the preacher. It is that he really believes his message is eternally important, and he doesn't seem able to persuade those who listen to him to believe it.

Men need God! I know that. Society needs God! No one can grope the path of our troubled day and fail to be heart-wrung with the conviction of society's need. Civilization needs God! It seems tottering upon its uncertain foundations. Too little of God has been run into the basic facts upon which our whole civic structure stands. I, a preacher, am called to preach a compelling gospel to such an age. This is the thing that

presses the preacher's soul. These heavy hours, these difficult days, these challenging counter claims! I am not asking to be delivered from full responsibility in the great struggle for the right. I am, however, desperately driven by the realization of the pitifully small results I seem able to achieve.

How slightly we do seem to move our age! I wonder often if those of whom we read now in compelling biographies really saw more encouraging results. We blast our little efforts against the great cold facts of life, and seem to see so scant an impression. Who, oh who is sufficient for this task to which we are called? Surely, there could be no reason to warn a preacher of our day against the danger of egotism. The ears of the world are confused with the static of conflicting interests. Who can shout into them a word of warning values? The eyes of the world are flushed with tears of genuine anxiety. Who can make visible through such tears the reality of God's care? The heart of the world is crushed with the tramplings of awful sorrow. Who can approach it to pour upon it the balm of sacred sympathy? O preacher! preacher! What have you to offer such an age as this? Is there any convincing reason why we should not be reckoned nonessential and set aside? These are practical days; are we practical men?

Such searching inquiry as suggested thus, and to which I personally am no stranger, challenges

our faith and sends me back to my pulpit, again and again, determined to find that word, and figure, and appeal that will get and hold attention and win action for the truth. I would not presume to use the Great Name in any sense of approach in stature. I do, however, dare to use it because I believe by such an approach we can all understand what it was that was driving the great soul of John Knox when in perfect agony of heart he cried, "Oh God! Give me Scotland or I die!" A great baptism of that same passion to-day upon us all would save us from some serious questions being raised as to what is the matter with the church. Little do I care personally as to what sacrifice this may require from us. I remember a tragic incident in the Great War of some aviators wrecked at sea. They freed a pigeon. The little bird winged its troubled way through an aerial battle where it was made a target by the enemy, and, though wounded, the little messenger kept its way, and guided by that strange compass in its nature, out of the storm of battle, it winged its hindered way to its destination and fell in collapse and died as they unwrapped the vital message it bore. O pigeon! pigeon! Who am I to draw back from sacrifice? The preacher who has caught at all at the pulse of his calling will lay down his life without one protest as to what he may have therefor.

"I seek not yours but you." That is the preacher's profit. To be sure, we are all called to

many duties beside, but if we are failing to reach and save the souls of our hearers, we are utterly failing in our dividends. The condemnation of the preacher does not lie in that he is not eloquent, or interesting, or in numerous lesser things: It does lie in his failure, even with all these other things, to get his real work done. The big difficulty in preaching is not in the way of merely attracting crowds to hear. That can be done, and may only be the magnification of the failure. A crowd to hear is not sure testimony. Our best work might be done in diminished companies. Jesus stands pre-eminent in such ministry.

Every little while someone seems again to catch the compelling message. God forgive the great company of us who at least seem to fail so badly. Now and then someone sounds the note that haunts a million ears. It is the genuine eloquence of the preacher of Christ. It is not the mere word of mouth, but, the rather, some strange fact of soul.

One day a company of easy talkers were glibly discussing the establishment of a new religion to set Christianity aside. Voltaire, caustic, keen, philosophic old skeptic that he was, sat silently listening to the easy decisions. Someone, anxious for his confirmation of the idea, asked him for his opinion, and he replied impressively with a piercing question, "Will the founder of this new religion be willing to be crucified for it?" The preacher's task is subject to this sacrificial judgment.

We are, however, encouraged as we read the preacher story. How impressively in the different ages and conditions and needs he has gone! Sometimes he has found his profits in little groups. Sometimes before crowding multitudes he has found his dividends. Sometimes he has set up his convincing pulpit in prison place, as Paul in Mamertine, and Bunyan at Bedford. In caves or lonely forests he has not been denied, as Jerome and Peter the Hermit. Exile has not been able to destroy his profits, as Chrysostom will testify. Flaming with his message he has commanded the state, as did Savonarola and John Knox. From the chair of the college he has gathered his success, as Erasmus and Melanchthon. Pastors with the kindly hand and the tender heart have won their rich rewards, as Baxter and Rutherford. Some have set appealing songs at the heart of the world, as Watt, and Newton, and Wesley.

The imperfect list I thus hurriedly called I did only to make mark of the fact that by force of character, and by patient continuance, and by genuineness of conviction the preacher of the gospel has had a real part in molding character and in shaping national destiny.

I can but feel when I make bold to glance thus along the way of the real preachers, how little and poor this great task must look as seen in me, how utterly unworthy the tiny measure I have been able to make. Yet, if I know my heart—and I

have had some solemn sessions with it—I assure you, I am sure of my purpose. I would far rather die in my pulpit in the flame of a message than to live on easily into a lingering old age because I shall have dared burn any less passionately for the truth as I see it. May God forgive all my all too many falterings, and blot out of the book of his remembrance all the poor paltry things of my life; but somehow, oh, somehow enable me everywhere and always to carry to all I may meet the assurance that the preacher of the gospel seeks souls for his hire. That is the preacher's profit, his only dividend.

In this uneasy day when men are so keenly anxious of dividends in ordinary, shall the preacher seem out of place if the passion for his own reward, the souls of his people, shall become dominant in him? Let me hasten to ask a better question: Will we preachers be forgiven if, in such a day, we become confused about our real profit, and grow dull to the real message we are to deliver to men? The challenge of this was enough to put the task to God who laid his own Son against it on the cross. How paltry the devil's measure of profit seems when he dared one day to try to barter with Christ and his task in the ordinary terms of pay, "All this will I give you"! The terms were all out of perspective. Christ was poor as men reckon riches. He had no bank balance. He came, however, the highest expression of divine desire. What

does he want? A palace? High heaven would fling him a star to pillow his head upon were that the yearning. "I seek not yours but you." That word clothed in divine interpretation is the secret which explains him.

O Christ, Son of God, this is a difficult way thou hast trodden before us. We poor disciples stumble so! Help us, oh help us to tread out now before our expectant day a sincere measure of this great ideal. We simply will not fail this great call. Come what may, our task is before us. We will dedicate anew our lives to this great onward movement in which our world has been moved all too slowly, the end of which is the kingdom of God, the power of which is the power of God, the proclaimers of which must be the preachers of God.

THE POET PROPHET OF THE SOCIAL ERA

William Leroy Stidger

In a Preaching Conference devoted to an interpretation of the social gospel we dare not ignore the contribution made by Edwin Markham, the poet prophet of the social era in American literature.

It is he who gives us, in one of his most recent poems which I shall quote in full before the end of this chapter, a slogan of battle for the Social Gospel and an affirmation of our faith:

> "The fight for justice fills the world,
> The flag of faith is never furled."

In that recent document, *Re-Thinking Missions*, a statement is made that one of the most distinctive contributions which the Christian religion has made to humanity is the idea of the sacredness of human personality. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, and particularly in Boston University, we had a great exponent and founder of what is called "the School of the Personalistic Philosophy," Dr. Borden Parker Bowne. Preachers must be concerned over the degradation of personality which is a result of unemployment these

days, and no single voice has sounded such a trumpet blast against that degradation of personality as has the voice of Markham.

In these desperate days of unemployment and depression, with ten million men out of work, millions of women filled with fear and worry, and little children starving, we are in an era of the degradation of personality such as the world has never witnessed before.

Day after day a man goes forth to find work, and finds it not. At first he went forth with confidence, his shoulders up, his head back, his eyes bright. But day after day he returns to his home in an apologetic mood. For months this degrading process goes on. His wife, worn by anxiety and worry, begins to chide him and to intimate that he has lost his will power; that he might get work if he would try harder. The woman is to be pitied—perhaps forgiven. But the damage is done just the same. During the three years of depression this man has become a beggar for work. He has gone to so many doors, he has been turned away so often, and so ruthlessly, that his spirit has been broken. He has become abject. He has suffered a deterioration of will power, morale, and attitude. He has lost his self-confidence. He has suffered a breakdown of personality. The fault is none of his. The conditions which brought this era of unemployment have not been of his making. Yet he is the chief

victim; he and his wife and children. Standards of living have been lowered to such a point that he does not even have enough food to keep up his physical strength, much less his moral courage and confidence. The whole family suffers a terrible deterioration of personality. When we get down to the roots of this matter, we find that the most terrible thing which is happening in this depression is this degradation of personality. And, in the name of the Christ who came that people might have life and that they might have it more abundantly; in the name of a Christ who came to teach the world a new reverence for personality, the Gospel of Social Justice about which we speak in this Preaching Conference, has come to its high noon. It is to such a day that we preachers have been called.

I

The Prophet of the Social Era Interprets the Meaning of the Kingdom

One wonders if the principles of the social message have ever been put more graphically into prose expression than Edwin Markham has put them; and one wonders if any man of our day has gone deeper into the heart of Christ to find the meaning of his life and message than Edwin Markham. Let us hear Markham's challenge to present-day preaching and Christianity:

"We call ourselves Christians; we are proud to

take the name of the Hero of the cross. But do we really know the deep significance of this professed allegiance to the Crucified? To know this we must first know what was the passionate purpose for man in the heart of Christ."

Then Edwin Markham proceeds to search for this purpose which was at the heart of Christ and his gospel. It is well to note, in passing, that our great social poet is in the process of writing what he thinks will be the greatest document of his creative life—a prose volume on which he has been laboring for a quarter of a century. It has been my privilege to read the chapters of this manuscript as they have been born white-hot from the heart of the poet of Democracy. That volume is to be called *The Forgotten Purposes of Jesus*. And, it deals entirely with the social goals of Christ. When this book is printed, it will startle the world. It will be one of the most revolutionary documents which has ever been written about our Master. Mr. Markham has given us at this conference the privilege of hearing some of that message first-hand. He will say in that volume:

"Let us search briefly this great problem of the Comrade Kingdom which Christ came to establish on this earth. What is the salvation brought by our divine Leader? Did he come merely to establish what we now call the church—a new sort of synagogue—a meeting-place for discussing prob-

lems of individual conduct or decorum? Is this the end of the great spiritual venture?"

And immediately the poet answers that question with tremendous emphasis:

"No! Emphatically No! For mere discussions of individual morality were carried on in Palestine with rampant energy in the long centuries before Calvary—carried on in microscopic arguments now recorded in the Talmud and the Midrashim. If Christianity is the mere discussion of individual conduct, then Christianity is only a new Judaism wherein we say Jesus instead of Jehovah.

"But Christianity is not a new Judaism. It is an utterly new vision of life. Jesus did not come preaching mere individual decorum: He came—as the record tells us, 'preaching the kingdom.'

"This kingdom—like all great ideas—has its center in man. It exists in the individual in first principles, for all growths begin in centers, all evolutions begin in seeds. Hence, 'the kingdom of heaven is within us.' But life is not expected to stay in centers, to stay in seeds. The seed must radiate its environment. The acorn must force its roots down into the earth and project its leafy branches into the atmosphere. So the kingdom that takes form within us, in character, should begin at once to take form outside of us in human institutions, take form in a new society where the Golden Rule shall be a working principle. For the

Christian, the New Testament is a call to the great adventure of love—heroic love."

Then Edwin Markham proceeds to show those of us who pretend to preach the New Testament what "The Comrade Kingdom," as he calls it, means, as interpreted by that document.

First: He says that the slogan, or the watchword, of that new kingdom is the Golden Rule: "Unto others as you would have others do unto you."

Second: He tells us that John the Baptist, who saw the meaning of the coming kingdom of God, thought of it in social terms, when he cried: "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand . . . now is the axe laid unto the root of the trees." Markham adds: "Terrible words follow this great utterance. We are told that this coming of the kingdom, this coming of the new order, involves an entire revolution in the world. Every evil tree is to be hewn down and cast into the fire; every evil habit, evil custom, evil institution, evil government is to be consumed in a flame unquenchable. All souls are to be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. They are to be baptized in the fire of heroic love that will burn away their inward selfishness and will set them aglow with the social passion of the Lord. In the heat of this flame, the cold, hard barriers of selfish familyism will dissolve and all families be drawn into one Divine Family of the Father."

Third: Edwin Markham gives us a swift survey

of the content of this great movement as it is to take form, according to the New Testament:

The spirit of man is to be changed from the self-seeking to the fraternal.

The social order is to be changed from the competitive to the co-operative.

The social order is to be changed from an order that tends to call out the mere animal cunning in man to an order that tends to call out the generosity and heroism in man.

The old kingdoms had been organized in a way that gave free rein to the energetic "self-seekers" who "devour widows' houses"; free rein to the bold exploiters and oppressors of mankind; but this new kingdom is to be the form of fraternity; a social providence over the people.

Says Edwin Markham about this new social order which I have sketched in its basic principles:

"All true Christians, then, are pledged to band together to create a new society in the world, a society that shall forsake the struggle for private riches and that shall institute a struggle for communal riches. In this society the battle for one's own life will be transformed into a battle for the lives of others. Why are Christians pledged to create a society of this noble order? Because it is only in a society organized on these high principles that a man can find room for the full expression of his generosities, for the free manifestation of the social passion of the Christ."

Fourth: Edwin Markham shows us that this was not only the meaning of John the Baptist but that it was the meaning of Christ himself:

"All men touched with this social vision will find that the teachings of the Christ are understandable only in the light of a new social order based upon his justice and warmed by his glowing spirit. He found our world order based on a cold nonhuman justice, based on exploitation and self-appreciation—each man for himself in a vast hunger for private riches. He found men lost in this selfish dream—found men without God and without hope in the world. He saw man gone insane with the earth-hunger—seeking happiness in the possession of mere things, seeking happiness that they never find.

"It is the chief distinction of our Master that he saw the remedy—the only possible remedy—for this old unhappiness of men. He saw that they must uproot the cause of their sorrows, must destroy the selfish principle. Again and again the Master warns us that the men of the new spirit must not try to get on with the old social order, the old social system, built up through long ages by the energetic few for the plunder of mankind. So we hear him crying out: 'Do not put new wine into old bottles. . . . Put new wine into new bottles!' At another time, in the sixth chapter of Matthew, he calls on us to look away from the order of life we have, to the higher order and nobler order we

may have by working for it. He makes it very clear that he recognizes our need for food, for clothing, and for roofs over our heads; but he urges us to 'seek first the kingdom of God and his justice,' the Comrade Kingdom founded on a divine justice unknown in the old world-order—urges us to seek this holy brotherhood, assuring us that within its friendly circle all workers will have their earthly needs supplied. And he tells us also that in this new order the old life-destroying worries will pass away, and men will live happily like the birds of the air, birds that gather their food from the bounty of the fields."

Fifth: Then this prophet poet of the new social era says that the Sermon on the Mount is the Constitution of the new social order in these words:

"Only in the light of this new society that must come can we understand and make workable the beautiful idealism of the Sermon on the Mount. For what is that sermon? It is usually looked upon by worldlings as a social rhapsody, a mere poetic dream. Yet it is in reality the greatest political utterance ever delivered to mankind. It is a challenge to our selfish social order by the supreme Man of our humanity, by the supreme Statesmen of the world. The Sermon on the Mount is not a mere rhapsody. Instead of this, it is the first swift outline of the Constitution of the new social order, the ideal that Christ carried in his heart

for the social salvation of the race. This new order was to be the working form for God on earth. It was to serve as a shelter over the race, an organic form for a social providence over the world. In this comrade order, and only in this order, is it possible to rescue the race from its social chaos. In this order, and only in this order, can men recover their lost happiness, for only in this order can they find an arena for an adequate expression of the suppressed generosities of their hearts, for the sleeping heroism of their souls. Only in this light can we understand the words and the works of the Man of Mystery and the Man of History—Jesus the Christ."

It is only in the light of this interpretation of the meaning that Jesus put on the coming kingdom of God that we who are its prophets and preachers may catch the spirit of this new kingdom of God.

And when we catch that interpretation of the Comrade Kingdom which Jesus came to establish; and knowing that it has not come as yet; then shall we go forth to battle for it with all of our energies of mind and body.

II

The Prophet Says the Kingdom Has Not Come

When, for the purposes of this address, I asked the prophet of the social era if even an approxi-

mation to the new kingdom has come, he spoke with wistful regret when he said:

"The Comrade Kingdom certainly has not come. As the true Christian looks out on our world to-day he sees much to sadden his heart. In truth he has been seeing much to sadden his heart for a decade. First, he saw the World War, the antithesis of the Comrade Kingdom. Then he saw the period of selfish inflation when 'things' were in the saddle, as Emerson puts it, and 'riding mankind'; when all we could think of was selfish acquisitiveness; when we rode high and wide on the winds of self-seeking and the egotism of self-possession; rode to reap the whirlwind which has now come to us. The third period brought us what we call 'The Depression,' with all of its terrible degradation of human personality. These three great periods of darkness—the World War, the Inflation, and the Depression—prove, even to the most obtuse, that the kingdom of God has not come, due to our own blind leadership and to our inability and our unwillingness to see what that kingdom means—and to preach it. And no small indictment of the plight of humanity in these three great anti-Christian movements falls at the feet of the church and its ministry.

"But I hasten to assure you that Christianity has not failed, for Christianity has nowhere been tried yet, nowhere been tried in a large social sense. Christianity has been tried by individuals, and

it has been found to be comforting and transforming. But it has never been tried by any large group of people in any one place—never by a whole city—never by a whole kingdom—never by a whole people. It is for this trial that the watching angels are waiting.

"Our holy religion is not a saving power merely for individuals; it is also a saving power for society in its industrial order. We have applied it to the individual in the past, but we have never made any whole-hearted effort to make religion the working principle of society. Religion is always co-operative and brotherly, but we have not yet made any earnest effort to apply the co-operative and brotherly principle to business. We have tried to persuade the individual to express the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount, but we have made no earnest effort to urge society to express the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount.

"Therefore, while it is true that we have individual Christians—men and women who make noble sacrifices in their effort to live the good life—it is also true that we have no Christian society anywhere on earth, no Christian civilization anywhere under the stars. Sometimes a careless talker will refer to our social order as 'a Christian civilization.' All such references disturb our hearts; for they prove that the speaker has no conception of what a Christian civilization would be, how noble and brotherly it would be. To speak of only

one thing, it is certain that in a Christian civilization these cruel riches we see standing side by side with these cruel poverties could not exist; they would all crumble and vanish away in the fire of the social passion of the Christ.

"If we have not a Christian civilization, what have we? We have a civilization that is half barbaric; we have a social order with a light sprinkling of Christians in it. It is the hope of the future that this body of earnest Christians, men and women, will awaken to the call of the social Christ, awaken determined to infuse his spirit into the industrial order, and thus extend the power of the cross down into the material ground of our existence. Men are not fully saved until tools are saved, until industries are saved. They must all be lit with the brother-spirit of Christ the Artisan.

"All the work-worn toilers of the world were to find rest in the new brotherly order about to be established on the earth. The Master has laid one great duty upon his followers—to embrother men and to emparadise the world. This is a great labor, for it demands that the spirit of the brother, Christ, who said, 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,' shall sing in all the wheels and sound in all the steps of our industrial life. It means that the Golden Rule shall become the working principle in our social order. This is the 'salvation' that

Christ came to bring to the world; this is the 'abundant life' of which he talked; this is the 'glad tidings,' the 'good will to all men'; this is the 'gospel,' the 'good news' to men."

And when we see how small a part of this Comrade Kingdom we have achieved and how little the dream of Christ is even understood by its preachers, we understand why the spirit of these lines should challenge us:

> "The fight for justice fills the world,
> The flag of faith is never furled."

III

The Social Message in the Prophet's Poetry

Having seen the conception of the Comrade Kingdom as Mr. Markham interprets it in the message of Christ; having seen the desperate need of its fulfillment; and how little of that kingdom had come to the earth; and what a beautiful and embrothered world it would be if that kingdom should come, let us go forth to bring it about singing the poetry, and living the poetry of that coming kingdom as Edwin Markham sings and lives it. For no man knows this prophet of the social era who does not know his social poetry as well as his social prose. Undoubtedly one of his greatest social utterances in poetry is one of his latest, written on the event of his eightieth birthday, the poem entitled "At Eighty Years."

"'All life is only one dark hour,'
Mutters the voice of Schopenhauer.
'Life is mysterious eclipse,'
Cry Leopardi's bitter lips.
'The best thing in this hapless strife,'
Cries Pliny, 'Is the *end* of life.
No man finds peace, for at the best
The fear of the future tears his breast.'
And Shakespeare, lord of the lyric kings,
Mourns the dark emptiness of things.
While Fichte, in old Teuton lands,
Saw mortals lifting eager hands,
Pursuing joy, joy that allures
And then eludes—never endures.
These are the findings of great men,
Long struggling in the wolfish den,
But I am wiser than these seers—
I at the height of eighty years.

"For while I hear despairing cries,
I have a faith that never dies.
I know that if we ceased from strife
We could stretch shelter over life;
Yet I see mothers giving birth
To babes unfit to fill the earth.
I see long lines of hungry men
Gaunt as gray wolves in lonely den.
Even in a country filled with bread,
Men go unsheltered and unfed.
I can but flash a sword of song
Against this anarchy and wrong.
I feel more tenderly the tears
Of all the world at eighty years.

"The fight for justice fills the world,
The flag of faith is never furled.
The sons of Satan throw their weight,
God's sons are also at the gate.
I know too if the battles fail,
If God's flag falters in the gale,
If soldiers of the common good
Lose in the cry for brotherhood,
If noble martyrs of good will
Go down to dust and shadow, still
The battle is worth while—the fight
Is one more flame against the night.
And they who nobly fail will find
The peace of the heroic mind,
Will taste life's sacred joy, the joy
Earth cannot give nor earth destroy.
These things I see as the cloud clears
Here at the height of eighty years."

Markham's first great indictment of our barbaric civilization which is so far from the ideals of Christ came in "The Man With the Hoe," which startled the world at the beginning of this century and inaugurated a new era in poetry—the social era. But so much has been said of that, and so often has that poem of social justice been quoted, that I shall assume that all who read this book are familiar with it; and with the fact that literary critics in America give Markham credit—and not Whitman—for interjecting a new spirit into creative poetry—credit for starting a new school of writing; and go on to quote some of his more recent social poetry.

Perhaps the most significant of his recent social poems, in the light of events in Russia, is his as yet unpublished poem entitled "Karl Marx," which he gives me the privilege of including here:

"He pressed forever toward a Godlike goal,
Some free place where the feet of men could rest
A little while, and joys invade the breast.
Two glories lighted up his battling soul,

"Wherever he groped through night and storm and hell—
One was the woman that into his battle came,
The wonder woman, fleet as darting flame;
And one was the Dream of which the ages tell.

"He was driven forth, hounded from land to land;
Yet through all hells her hand was in his hand.
The right of men to labor and to live—
This dream was on him; and, with no applause,
He held his way, a Dream's pale fugitive—
True to a woman and an outcast Cause."

As recently as June, 1929, the poet expressed himself socially on Christ and the church in these regnant lines, entitled "The Church of Rebels":

"This is my Holy Church, my sacred Shrine:
In this God-house are heard the mighty themes
Of those who have power to perish for their dreams.
Here is the altar of the Singing Nine
Where brave souls taste the eternal bread and wine—
The bread of brotherhood, the wine of dare.
Here they climb upward to immortal air,
And scatter on men new valors from heavens divine.

"To this God-house the young redeemers come:
Here is Mazzini the lifted face:
Here is young Shelley, one of the starry race:
Here all the heroes of the martyrdom.
And to this house of life that fears not death,
Came the young Radical from Nazareth."

But even more beautifully and simply than that picture of the "Young Radical from Nazareth" is his great plea to "Live and Help Live," rather than "Live and Let Live":

" 'Live and let live!' was the call of the Old—
The call of the world when the world was cold—
The call of men when they pulled apart—
The call of the race with a chill on the heart.

"But 'Live and help live!' is the cry of the New—
The cry of the world with the Dream shining through—
The cry of the Brother World rising to birth—
The cry of the Christ for a Comrade Earth."

We catch a ring of hope in Markham's later social poems, such as sounds in the following social prophecy, which he calls "How Heaven Comes."

"The Heaven we seek will not be found
In golden flights of glory;
But in this little daily round,
This common human story.

"Heaven is in little useful deeds,
Lighted by Love's great passion:
Out of the humble human needs
All Heavens take form and fashion.

"Man never gets pure heaven from God
However much he wrestles:
All Heavens must come through clay and clod,
In common earthen vessels.

"The Gates of Paradise are near:
Awake, away, and win them:
That heartening word, that friendly tear,
Have Hallelujahs in them."

It is my privilege to close this chapter with a personal letter from the poet himself, a letter which came to me in response to an invitation to Mr. Markham to attend our Preaching Conference on the Social Gospel. I also told him of what I was to say about his own putting of that social gospel into prose and poetry, and with his usual humility—the humility of true greatness—his letter implies that he has been negligent and that he must get at the business of prophesying.

His letter reads:

Madonna has sent me your good last letter, and I am thrilled by your Markhamic program and propaganda. Certainly, you are setting free a lighted balloon, which will draw the eyes of countless thousands. Your Edwin Markham, poet-prophet, would do well to get busy prophesying. He should study John the Baptist—John of the Sands—who came up out of the desert, crying, "Let him who has two coats give one to him who has none; let him who has two loaves give one to him who is hungry."

Certain it is, that we must begin to cry to the perishing people the gospel of the Comrade Kingdom. In

the old days preachers proclaimed an individualistic redemption, the escape of the individual into a place of spiritual safety. But this idea must be expanded to include collective humanity. However it was on the past, it is now certain that there is no available salvation for the people except social salvation.

It is the purpose of the Divine Master to draw men so closely together that they would all stand upon a common ground, an economic and industrial ground—so closely together that in all the activities of life they would feel the beating of comrade hearts. He knew that brotherhood must have a material basis. And he had a vision of all this in his heart when he cried out to the workers of the world: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Yours in the hope of the Comrade Kingdom,

EDWIN MARKHAM.

So this poet preaches and prophesies the new social era. The theme of his prophecy and of his dream is the spirit of Him whom he calls "The Comrade Christ." And to Edwin Markham the "Kingdom of God" of which Christ speaks so often is "The Comrade Kingdom." What a gospel for these desperate days!

But, best of all, Edwin Markham who likes to autograph his books with this sentence, "Come let us live the poetry we sing!" lives this social gospel. He follows the Comrade Jesus. Having earned a small fortune with his poetry, he has nothing. His home is humble. He never takes

a Pullman car in his travels, even at eighty. He eats moderately, because, as he says: "I cannot eat an expensive meal when so many people of the world are starving." He has renounced things. They have no possession of his soul. No Tolstoy has more completely renounced things. No Gandhi has more completely given up the material possessions of life. No Kagawa has so completely consecrated himself to the Comrade Kingdom of God. Edwin Markham is the great Poet Prophet of the Comrade Kingdom of God on earth.

It was in a great period of industrial, spiritual and economic depression that John Wesley, Methodism's great prophet of social as well as spiritual awakening, came to England. It was into an industrial order that he came; into a depression worse than the one we find ourselves engulfed by at this time. He came to preach personal and social salvation. We too have come to such an hour. My prayer for my readers is that you may catch the spirit of Edwin Markham; that you may saturate your soul with the Markhamic gospel, which had its inspiration primarily in the spirit of Jesus; that you may see and feel and preach the implications of this social singing. Let it challenge your minds! Let it be a lightning flash to your visions, clarifying your murky skies! Let it be the Jovian thunder of a new resolution in your preaching! Let it be in the spirit of our poet's, "The Peril of Ease":

"Are you sheltered, curled up and content
by the world's warm fire?
Then I say that your soul is in danger!
The sons of the Light, they are down with
God in the mire,
God in the manger.

"The old-time heroes you honor, whose banners
you bear,
The whole world no longer prohibits:
But if you peer into the past you will find
them there,
Swinging from gibbets.

"So rouse from your perilous ease, to your
sword and your shield:
Your ease is the ease of the cattle.
Hark, hark, where the bugles are calling:
Out to some field—
Out to some battle!"

PREACHING AND PROHIBITION

EDWIN HOLT HUGHES

WILL ROGERS, our humorist who is not wholly humorous in calling himself a Methodist, recently gave out substantially this bit of paragraphing: "Last Sunday I took up my radio and listened to four preachers, hoping that I would get something for my soul. Two of them was damning the Republicans, and the other two was damning the Democrats. I made up my mind that a poor old sinner wouldn't have much chance for salvation until after the eighth of November." Evidently, there is an immediateness in the problem now being discussed! It is right here, thundering on every side of us, shrieking at us from a thousand throats. But how incomplete this list of themes would have been if the subject had not been assigned to someone! So with warm thanks for the compliment embodied in asking me to consider this turbulent and thorny theme, I invite you to listen while I submit the whole matter to four different tests.

I. The first test to be observed in the preaching of Prohibition is the law of proportion. No one cause is the summation of all causes. For the pastor who appears many times annually be-

fore his people the rule of balance is imperative. We may rightly approve the work of men who give themselves almost entirely to the promotion of the Sabbath cause; the Child Labor cause; the Peace cause; the Industrial cause; the Prison cause. These specialists may be allowed to become noble monomaniacs. But the pastor who permits his ministry to bulge at one point of excess is headed for trouble, not only because his people become weary of the twanging of one string upon the harp of life, but also because they resent, perhaps unconsciously, the failure of a religious teacher to declare the "whole counsel of God," on account of his devotion to an important fragment. The temptation here with reference to Prohibition probably varies with the periods. There have been times when the trend of some preachers' discourses would have implied that life was largely a hostile mug, or stein, or decanter. Souls that are constantly served with doses of verbal strong drink, and wine and beer, will ere long feel the need of spiritual proteins and fats and will complain that in his giving out of calories their minister is a poor spiritual dietitian. We have all known men who ceased to be ministers and became Prohibitionists. The single reform became their absorption. They were intemperate in the use of one subject until at last they seemed to be intoxicated with their constant theme.

When the issues become confused by a political

campaign the undoubted tendency in some pulpits is toward a silence which is another form of misproportion. Some of us have been frightened by the cry of "political preaching." For many years our crusade continued on nonpartisan lines; and that fact made for a freedom of discussion. Platforms spoke only of law-observance and law-enforcement and remanded the deeper debates to more spiritual forums. Unfortunately, this is no longer so. The planks that go into the party platforms are so big that only a *giganta sequoia* would furnish unspliced lumber wide enough for the statements; while condidates' acceptance speeches enlarge the planks into rostrums! Even as some of the speakers at the National Political Conventions found it difficult to speak above the howling of the galleries, so does the pulpit find it hard to state its conviction without meeting the accusation of clerical politics. Perhaps there is an advantage in the bewildering situation, in that it may lead us to avoid the personalities of the period and may serve to throw us back upon the vast principles of our reform. In these days it amounts to a training in skilled homiletics—to learn how to cleave between that lower political mood which makes for partisanship and that higher political mood which establishes our citizenship in the colony of heaven. We should not be scared away from the advocacy of a century-old reform by the yapping party-ites of a passing

political campaign. God's calendar comprises more than the second Tuesday in November. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. The essential righteousness of our cause has not been converted to wickedness by the howls of balcony mobs. A yell is not a referendum. There is a strange translation in Jeremiah which says, "Pharaoh king of Egypt is but a noise." Is the Israel of God to be frightened from her borders by clamor? This is a time when the principle of Prohibition is to be proclaimed, unless, indeed, we are to confess that a ten-decade agitation has been based on a falsehood. It is interesting and ludicrous to hear men with one breath declaiming that Prohibition as a principle is wrong, and with the next breath declaring that the saloon must not return! If a law against the sale of liquor is wrong in principle, then it is wrong for any civic unit—nation, state, county, city, town, village, ward! And if Prohibition as a principle is wrong in civics, is it right in industry? To admit that law has no real relation to this whole reform is to surrender the final trench of the ethical warfare. Therefore, the big task of the present-day preacher is not at all to emphasize the personalities of a temporary campaign but to proclaim the permanent doctrine that good citizenship calls for a ceaseless contest against a traffic which has always been a defier of law and a defiler of life.

The other aspect of balance carries us over into the personal spirit. Is there any other crusade that puts such a strain upon judgment, such a pressure upon nerves, such a drain upon feeling, so that our speech upon it seems to leave us with moral exhaustion? We must all wonder at times how Jesus felt after he had cleansed the Temple with the whip of cords. There is a debate about the instrument itself. Was it a gentle weapon, like a lady's fan, a kind of swishing pretense? Or was it a more efficient implement, as severe as it sounds in the original Greek or in the translated English? Evidently, the wielder of it was not a mere pretender; and his language of expulsion was not quite a lullaby. Victor Hugo once wrote that the whip of cords was "a rude speaker of truths"; and surely one of the truths was that indignation against men who turned God's Temple into a den of thieves was henceforth to have a precedent. Or, again, we wonder how the Master felt after he had scorched his way through the scalding indictment of the Pharisees. His woe against them was at last relieved by the pathetic climax—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" It is no easy thing to speak against an institution as cruel as the liquor traffic without showing an

awful indignation of spirit. But if the fierce heart always ends as the tender heart, we shall perhaps come near to that balance of judgment and mercy that hurts that it may heal. The wrath that we express should not be the wrath of the lion but the wrath of the Lamb.

II. Our second test is that of biblical authority. As a book that grew up out of long and deep life, lived under the sense of God, the Bible may itself complete our first test by giving us a balance of teaching. A surprise awaits the man who tries to gather from the greater Bible the smaller Bible of Temperance and Prohibition. A revealing exercise at the beginning of one's ministry would be to search the Scriptures for all its references to this general theme; clip the verses; paste them into the fair-sized volume which they would make; and hold them ready against those many days when the friends of slight potations appear with their tiny biblical armory!

As our preaching has been so vitally rooted in the Holy Bible, it is inevitable that this book of our faith should come into the discussion. Very quickly we meet with a singular difficulty—an inheritance, in part, from the old theory of an infallible and even dictated volume. If all parts of the Scriptures are equally inspired, then it requires only one or two passages that seem friendly to wine and strong drink to make discomfort for an abstainer or a Prohibitionist. Our advocates

of liquors have been quick to seize upon this embarrassing angle of attack. Their final trench or redoubt is always found at Cana of Galilee. Often it would seem as if that were the only town in their spiritual geographies. Their argumentative journeys end at Cana rather than at Calvary —the wine offered at the one concealing the wine refused at the other.

In reality, the experience is not a new one for the Bible itself. If the Book were a sensitive and conscious thing, it would surely protest against the company into which it has often been forced. Biblical precedents were the last flicker of argument for bigamy and polygamy; and as late as our own period that type of plea was used for admitting to Congress a man who tried to enter with a wife on either arm! In spite of the fact that plural marriage filled the moving tents of the patriarchs with bickerings and jealousies and strifes, and in spite of the further fact that it made a fading debauchee of Solomon, the scriptural argument was the last to perish.

This history was measurably repeated in the struggle with slavery. Little emphasis was given to the statement of the Bible itself that "the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Since slaves were in the Book they must therefore always remain in civilization. The Epistle to Philemon was liberally used in the debate that

preceded the Civil War. Onesimus' other name was Dred Scott; and Saint Paul was the judicial partner of Justice Taney! In both the polygamy discussion and the slavery discussion events were made more meaningful than principles, the letter more vital than the spirit. Yet in the end the spirit and the principle won not only the day but the total almanac; and the man who would now comfort the bigamous or the slave-holding with biblical quotations would be deemed an eccentric anachronism!

Evidently, the scriptural drift must be considered instead of an occasional eddy of the record. Tempted to cast itself down from the precipice of drink, society must hear out of the Bible many other voices that forbid it to tempt the Lord God. The analysis of the Old and New Testaments in their references to this subject of drink would appear to give us the following results:

First, the passages where wine is rated with the medicines of earth—as a cordial for the fainting and the sick. Approximately, there are seven of these references. If the fruit of the vine had been kept wholly in this medicinal realm, it is not likely that the world would have been tormented by the age-long problem of intemperance.

Second, the passages of poetic reference where wine is listed among the symbols of noisy joy—as, indeed, it was in the description of Pentecost itself. There are perhaps fourteen of these. Even

here there is the offset in those other verses where wine staggers into the company of evil words and moods: the wine of the condemned; the wine of God's wrath; the wine of astonishment; the wine of violence; the wine of fornication; the wine of fury; the wine which is the poison of dragons.

Third, the passages in which the evils of wine and strong drink are vigorously recognized and in which the red signals of warning are lifted above the roads of life. This group of verses, gathered into a unity, would make an impressive code of caution. There are certainly not less than twenty-eight of these individual sign-posts, directing men away from the paths of poverty and imbecility, and death, perhaps fearfully climaxed in the warning of Proverbs—"Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? . . . who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder."

Fourth, the passages in which the social dangers are noted and by which men are called away from dealing in the poison of society. The border line between this list and the last-named list is not easy to establish; yet at least thirty-seven times wine and strong drink are presented in their cruel social effects. When he comes, in First

Corinthians, to conditions which unfit men for the final and glorious society, Saint Paul pronounces one dreadful word of expatriation and leaves it written in ominous letters over the portals of the Lord's realm: No drunkard shall "inherit the kingdom of God."

Fifth, the passages in which the individual effects of drink are given in story form: Noah lying in the naked shame of his drunkenness; Lot betrayed by his daughters into an inconceivable paternity; Amnon made merry with wine by the agents of the scheming Absalom, only to die soon like the drunken dog; the Corinthians moving to the wine of the holy communion, to debauching bodies and hearts, and coming to sleep in premature graves. A drunkard's death as an unholy goal of the Holy Feast—what can quite equal this accursed lure of wine?

Sixth, the passages which describe the ideal life, or the approach to sacred duties and mediations. Here, first, is the counsel to Aaron, chosen as the pioneer of the Lord's priesthood, "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die." Or, again, as translated by Moffatt: "The Eternal said to Aaron, 'When you or your sons enter the Trysting tent, never drink wine or liquor, lest you die; this is to be a standing rule from generation to generation, that you may distinguish what is sacred and what is

profane; what is unclean and what is clean.' "[1] Here are the Rechabites, the sons of Jonadab, standing true to total abstinence and winning a continuance of their tribe down through the centuries. Here are the Nazirites, set aside to God, and so set aside from the false stimulations of wine and strong drink. Here is the priest's rule ere he enters the deeper sanctuary to stand between God and man, "No priest shall drink wine when he enters the inner court;" or as in the lament of Amos as coming from Jehovah:

"I raised up sons of yours as prophets,
and young men to be Nazirites.
Is it not so, O Israel?
the Eternal asks you.
But you gave Nazirites wine to drink,
and forbade prophets to prophesy.
So now I make steps collapse,
as a cart collapses, laden with sheaves."

Here is the mysterious Lemuel in the last chapter of Proverbs, receiving his oracle from his mother:

"Son of mine, heed what I say,
listen, O son of my prayers, and obey.
Waste not your strength on women,
your love on these destroyers of a king.
It is not for kings to be quaffing wine,
nor for princes to be swilling liquor."

[1] Scripture quotations in this chapter from *The Holy Bible: A New Translation* by James Moffatt, are used by permission of Harper Brothers, publishers.

In the ideal royalty praised by the ideal woman the cup of fire is an outlaw. Here, finally, is the case of John the Baptist where the promise to the trembling Zacharias is: 'Thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb, and many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God." If the forerunner of Jesus bore the credentials of abstinence, his after-runners may do well to give heed to the lesson. The ideals of the Bible are not distilled in the wine presses; nor are they perfected in the shops where glistening fermentations turn to squirming snakes that bite and sting and at last crawl slimily through imaginations twisted by trembling delirium.

III. The third test, relating to the legitimacy and the type of Prohibition preaching, is the test of social welfare. It is always the tendency of evil to go so far in disaster as to invite the terrific reaction. The embezzler begins with small amounts and moves on to vast thieveries. The plagiarist starts with small literary appropriations and moves down the road of dishonesty until he actually rules out the distinctions between *meum* and *tuum* and publishes his neigh-

bor's words as his own. Wickedness nails Jesus to a cross only to discover duly that the crucifixion adds to the mystical power of the Lord.

Just now the compromisers on abstinence and Prohibition are in many cases yielding to a dangerous doctrine which puts personal liberty far above social welfare. Such a tendency is against at least one half of all that Christian preaching is supposed to advocate and accomplish. The commandment that we are to love God with all our being runs like a golden strand through the warp of our sermons, while the commandment that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves is an equally persistent strand. For a man to declare that he drank wine and strong drink as an evidence of his love to his Maker would strain the fragment of sincerity remaining in the insincere; while the declaration that he was drinking for his neighbor's good would seem as doubtful morally as it would be physiologically! We have already seen that the drift of the Bible classes wine and rum as among the social curses of life. But early the social emphasis appears more broadly on the holy pages. The first murderer denied its right to control him. His frigid question was, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The form of his inquiry was really its answer. If he is your brother—Yes! But like a piece of brutal skepticism that query has floated out over the lands and islands of humanity. Its icy indifference has chilled all the

hemispheres of life; and for nineteen hundred years it has resisted the melting power of the Saviour's cross of love. In our current discussion on abstinence and Prohibition it has reappeared in a heartless form—as if, indeed, it had not been wearied by its age-long contest with social love. When Moses found two Hebrews fighting, he sought to stop their blows by the appeal, "Ye be brethren"; and the failure to make a people use that principle resulted in forty years' wandering in a wilderness! Are we now getting ready for a brutal march through moral marshes and thickets because our brothers' keeping, even in respect of a physical appetite, is a secondary thing?

The growth of that social consciousness is apparent in the Scriptures. It had its breadth in attacking all kinds of wrong—false balances, cruel usury, financial oppression—as in these words:

> "Woe to him who stores ill-gotten gains,
> seeking to set his nest on high,
> safe from the clutches of calamity."

That biblical community sense, also, urged all the cluster of duties to be observed between man and man. But it had its narrowed point in its attack upon wine and strong drink from the strictly social standpoint. The prophets held not their peace. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Nahum, Micah, Habakkuk, Joel, all thundered on the theme. They are joined by the unknown writer of the Proverbs,

evidently not fully trained in the modern percentage distinction among intoxicants—"Wine is a mocker; strong drink is raging; and whoso is deceived thereby is not wise." Or if you prefer Moffatt here it is—

"Wine means mockery; liquor means brawling;
there is no sense in reeling under drink."

We may hear, as well, the social woe of Habakkuk in the Scotchman's version again:

"Woe to him that makes his neighbors drain the
goblet of his fury,
and makes them drunk, to gloat on their disgrace!
Drink yourself now and stagger,
for the cup in the Eternal's hand comes round
to you.
And shame, not glory, gluts you."

When it comes to the more specific duty of those who as priests and mediators represent God to men the grim heralds of the Lord are dreadful in their indictments. Micah declares of a debased Israel,

"The prophet for a folk like this would be some
empty fellow and a liar,
who promised to prophesy of wine and spirits."

Is there to-day such a folk as that? And can there be found a modern prophet whose voice is lifted for iniquity? Isaiah has a like vision, only of greater horror—

"Yet here too men are reeling drunk
and staggering in their cups;
prophets and priests are reeling drunk,
fuddled with liquor;
they reel amid their revelations,
they stumble as they give their charges;
they vomit foully over the sacred tables,
till not a place is clean."

That ancient forth-teller for God felt that he saw this traffic invade the temple itself, capturing the consciences and even the habits of the professed representatives of the Eternal. Could personal liberty go farther in its victory over the most sacred social obligation?

The dark truth is that the first two appearances of wine in the Bible are altogether forbidding; and in both cases wine becomes a mocker of the social and domestic sense. Ere we pass from the first ten chapters Noah lies drunken in the shame of his nakedness; and the sordid scene is not completed until we hear a father cursing his own son. Before we pass from the second ten chapters wine is used in a hideous way, and the daughters of Lot are conspiring against their father in a nameless abomination, while giving the first example of that combination of intoxicants with impurities which in our near period made rum the favorite partner with prostitution. Yet in the later years the domestic positions have been reversed; the injury has been from parents to children rather

than from children to parents. In the saloon days there were numberless cases where fathers would steal clothes from the children's bodies, and bread and milk from the mouths of their babes in order that they might ease their own mad craving. They would go farther than that. In a tragic passage the prophet Joel writes the unbelievable: "They have . . . sold a girl for wine, that they might drink." Eight thousand invitations, made alluring by lights and music, gleamed along Chicago's streets and even by salted food sought to create a profitable thirst! In the presence first and last of a million debaucheries did social welfare have no lesson for good men and women? And are we now to allow the demon of personal liberty to renew his double domination—that of alluring the weak to their downfall and that of persuading the strong that their example is a matter of indifference?

Doubtless Saint Paul's two laws, so vital in real preaching, bring the whole case on to its personal and social climax. We must all be smitten at heart by the individual appeal: "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." We confess the august idealism of this call. The heart of it could certainly not be omitted from our preaching. To bring every cup that we hold in our hands under the dominion of God—to make every dish a "Lordly dish" in the holiest sense—is not

this a high and inescapable ambition? If this command appeals to the individual mystic in each of us, Saint Paul's other law appeals to the social conscience in each of us. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth." The particular matter of which the apostle was writing was really of far less significance for destruction than our twentieth-century problem of drink. Without possible question far more people have been injured and destroyed by wine and liquor than were ever slightly tormented by the ethical and social problem of the meat that had been offered to idols. We may well query whether this law of charity has any possible application if it does not have a vital meaning for the social customs of drinking. If one half of what the foes of abstinence or Prohibition say about the drinking of to-day be true; if our land is being soaked and debauched by juvenile drunkenness as the pseudo-reformers claim, then the Christian man who does not feel that the apostolic rule of consideration should lead him to lawfulness and teetotalism must have a strangely contorted conscience. If the man has the kind of an ego that, like a perverted solipsism, clings to itself as the only certainty, and so as the only consideration, the law of charity appeals to him in vain. Does not social welfare compel the follower of Jesus to substitute drink for meat in the apostle's principle so

that he can say, "If liquor make my brother to offend, I will drink no liquor while the world standeth"? Some of us have adopted that rule as a cherished vow, and we intend to keep our pledge to man and God against all the sophistries and jeers of a gainsaying world. It is the assured judgment of some of the best minds and hearts of this day that the ministers of Christ, in addition to standing by that law of the land as written into our Constitution, should also in their preaching put a sacred emphasis upon that inner law of love which every man naturalized into God's kingdom must carry always in a redeemed heart.

IV. The fourth test to be used in the preaching of Prohibition is that of the spirit of Christ. Recognizing the progressive element in revelation, we are bound to the view that this is the supreme test, carrying with itself all needful modifications of the other tests already given. We are quickly confronted with a reported deed of Jesus, a deed already briefly mentioned; and we are enjoined by our foes that this action of Christ stands as a concrete and dramatic denial of much that we say. We must sometimes think that there are many unbelievers or semibelievers who accept no miracle save that wrought at the marriage feast in Cana and who concede that, not as a credential of the power of Jesus but, rather, as a discomfiture for his so-called fanatical followers! They are ready to quote the

literary condensation of the event in the words, "The conscious water saw its God and blushed," largely because the story makes the advocates of abstinence join in the blushing! One temperance lecturer—a decided liberal in theology—met the issue by saying that the miracle never occurred, and that it was merely a token of the tremendous impression which Christ made upon his early followers and which required miraculous glory to do him justice. This cuts the Gordian Knot but seems to leave some frayed edges, as if, indeed, the lovely strands had been hacked rather than neatly and reverently severed!

It is small use to say to these arguers—who are only sectional believers in Jesus for debating purposes—that there are two words in the original that discriminate between wines. The retort is apt to be an intimation that the defender of Jesus and the opponent of wine is himself a two-word person leading a double life! These debaters are determined to put Jesus into the regular wine business and to insist that the Master was not a wonder-working lawbreaker but that he was strictly following the excise laws of Heaven which suggest, therefore, the proper regulations for earth! A campaigner against Prohibition, not noted for his religious orthodoxy, insisted in the evening in public debate with his clerical opponent that "wine is wine," but on the next day, passing a stand where cider was invitingly ex-

hibited and feeling the return of a boyhood thirst, carefully inquired as to the mood of the beverage in the courteous admission for his preacher comrade that while "cider is cider," it is not always one kind of cider—as a vinegar bottle might well prove! Wine may be wine in the sense of origin; and wine may be classified in the sense of fermentation. It is not easy to discuss the incident at Cana without seeming to become flippant. It would, however, be a strange faith in a miracle-working Lord to declare that he could make wine by Lordly power, but that he could not determine what kind he would make, being shut up to the formula that would stimulate the tongues of the guests or possibly send them staggering homeward down Cana's boisterous streets! If we are to have a faith in Christ that is not daunted by the tale of a miracle, we ought to be able to reach that higher faith that holds the deed of Christ within the borders of holiness. In the New Testament records only the enemies of Jesus ever ventured to declare that he himself was a wine-bibber; and his friends in the modern time will continue to believe that he holds the cup in reserve for those holy seasons which remind us of loving sacrifice or prophesy to us of the day when we shall drink it anew with him in the kingdom of God.

After Christ comes, wine and strong drink begin to move toward an unpleasant and forbidden

background. Even the poetic references, with any favorable bearing, have no room in the New Testament: and the remainder seems to be kept for the sacramental purposes of life. With the exception of Paul's much discussed advice to Timothy about taking wine for his stomach's sake and his oft infirmities, the luring cup disappears into the realm of evil metaphor. The drunken are in the night, literally and spiritually. The reeling harlot sips the blood of the saints. The final beverage of the wicked is the wine of the wrath of God; his marching-place the winepress of the like anger. After we leave Cana, there is no real comfort for the bibulous exegete. The trend is steadily toward the spiritual incitement, "Be not drunk with wine, wherein [wine] is excess; but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Without question an evangelized people becomes a sober people. The deepest relation of preaching to abstinence and Prohibition is in this region. A widespread revival of religion such as came to our land in the fifties and seventies would have the surest protection of our people against the flood-tides of rum that are now threatening us. Such a work of grace would substitute for all the vulgar stimulation of wines and liquors the glad intoxication of the Spirit of God. It would also prove the highest form of the edu-

cational process so necessary in the present exigency of the temperance reform. After the worst has been said about church attendance, it still remains true that the preachers are the only men in America who can regularly draw literally millions to public gatherings. They are, therefore, the premier educators of our citizens in the personal prohibition that we call total abstinence, as well as in our whole social dream of a sober nation.

There is yet another phase of this fourth test. Our campaign for Prohibition cannot be called a selfish one. Neal Dow and Frances E. Willard and their splendid colleagues through these years have not been living and working for their own interests. The millions of money that have been put into our work have not been financial investments as such; they have, on the contrary, represented the desire to dedicate the mammon of unrighteousness to the higher commerce, and even to coin it into souls who would greet us at the gates of the best earthly tabernacles and of the eternal habitations. In this long period of agitation some men have sacrificed their political ambitions; others have gladly suffered the epithets hurled from the camps of rum; yet others have seen churches and parsonages stoned or burned; while still others, like George C. Haddock on the Sioux City bridge, have fallen as martyrs in the dark night of assassination be-

cause they were sons of the far-off light. If living and toiling for others is an evidence of the spirit of Christ, then surely this lengthy and sacrificial campaign for Prohibition has carried one of the Lord's certain credentials. Just now this sacrifice takes on a peculiar form, perhaps harder to endure than the less subtle persecutions of the former day. Merciless propaganda puts us at a disadvantage and deceives even some of the elect in our churches while our slogans have been pilfered by men and women who were as silent in their attitude toward the saloon fifteen or twenty years ago as they are now vociferous in their insistence that the saloon must not return. In a way it is marvelous that our lines have not been more weakened. Our preachers and people, particularly in certain cities where the journalism of Sodom holds sway, have had a great chance for granite convictions and for unshaken character. For the loyal ones there remains this consolation: that hitherto they have given themselves to this cause in the unselfish spirit of Christ; and that if duly legalized liquor returns to our towns and deadly saloons infest the automobile highway and send up the brutal curve of mortality, they will stand innocent amid the wreckage, sorrowfully leaving to the agitators for wine or strong drink the tragic responsibility for the carnage.

There remains for quick statement another

phase of this fourth test. We have been able to summon to our gatherings the spirit of Christ. We have truly had in this region a monopoly of prayer. In the old days the brewers and distillers had difficulty in finding a clergyman who would open their conventions with devotional exercises. Clerical compromisers might remain silent, but they greatly preferred not to become vocal in carrying the cause of rum for approval to the throne of a just God. Just now the Crusaders may be able to command many dress suits and tuxedos and may disport themselves amid the glitter of evening gowns; but the finding of the clerical surplices worn by one who will consent to bless their enterprise with his prayers will be no easy task. Some clergymen may be equal to sympathy with the wet propaganda and may express it in the quieter circle; but they will scarcely be equal to the sacrilege that tries to pull Jesus toward a platform of wine or beer or to use his holy name in petitions for a cause far more than doubtful. God be thanked that our contention can be made in the house of the Lord! God be thanked again that our messages and arguments can be preceded by prayer that is in no danger of blasphemy!

M. A. DeWolfe Howe has a poem in a recent issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, based presumably on a versified statement of James Russell Lowell, that Lowell was waiting for a king when what he

needed was kingship in himself. Bemoaning the want of a guide, listening for an outer voice of power, watching for the coming of a man "kingly of mien and thought," we, the two poets suggest, are to make leadership in our own souls. Where is our Moses? Our Alfred the Great? Our William of Orange? The reply is—

"Seek him within: it is you, it is I, that are wanting!
Whom shall we know for a chief who never have seen
One in our hearts; nor marched with the songs of his chanting—
Songs of the selfless, generous, brave, and serene?

"Be it He of the Cross, be his form of another making—
Only be sure that each in his soul sees clear
The shape of a leader all worthy to follow, uptaking
His arms when the long-waited captain of men shall appear.

"For what were a leader with none that are ripe for the leading,
To hail him as chief, to fare in his starlit way?
Seek him and make him within, his image heeding,
Till shadow be substance, and darkness the splendor of day!"[1]

But we shall not entertain Howe's slight doubt as to the identity of the Leader for our Cause. Our confident appeal is to Him who bore a cross. The goal that we seek is set by him. The spirit that we need he gives. When at last we reach the

[1] Reprinted by permission.

prophesied city wherein no abomination dwelleth, we shall discover that the leadership within us was created by the Leader above us: and that the cup of the wine of God's wrath, poured upon the altars of Babylon, becomes the real sacrament of the presence of Christ on the temple altars of the New Jerusalem.

Bibl 14
112
114

Evangeline
freelibrary
86

Kogawa
"Confinement"
48

new techniques of preaching
51

110522

BV
4235
S6
085

110522

Oxnam, G. Bromley
Preaching and the
social crisis

DATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME

NO 20 '70 John Evans

Oxnam
Preaching and...

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.